arXiv:math/0610145v1 [math.AP] 4 Oct 2006

PARTIAL REGULARITY FOR MINIMA OF HIGHER ORDER FUNCTIONALS WITH $p(x)$ GROWTH

JENS HABERMANN

Abstract. For higher order functionals $\int_\Omega f(x, \delta u(x), D^m u(x))\, dx$ with $p(x)$– growth with respect to the variable containing $D^m u$, we prove that $D^m u$ is Hölder continuous on an open subset $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$ of full Lebesgue– measure, provided that the exponent function $p : \Omega \to (1, \infty)$ itself is Hölder continuous.

1. Introduction

In this paper we are concerned with regularity for minimizers of quasiconvex functionals of higher order with $p(x)$– growth.

We consider functionals of the type

$$\mathcal{F}[w, \Omega] = \int_\Omega f\left(x, \delta w(x), D^m w(x)\right)\, dx, \tag{1.1}$$

on the space $W^{m,1}_{loc}(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N)$, $N > 1$, where $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ is an open bounded domain and $f : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^{nN} \times \ldots \times \mathbb{R}^{N\binom{n+m-1}{m}} \to \mathbb{R}$ a Carathéodory function. $\delta w \equiv (w, Dw, \ldots, D^{m-1}w)$ denotes the vector containing the lower order derivatives. For $k = 1, \ldots, m$ we use the notation $D^k u \equiv \{D^\alpha u_i\}^{|\alpha|=k}_{i=1,\ldots,N}$ for the derivative of order k. Note that $D^k u$ is an element of the space $\odot^k(\mathbb{R}^n; \mathbb{R}^N)$ of symmetric k–linear forms on $\mathbb{R}^n$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^N$ which can be identified with the space $\mathbb{R}^{N\binom{n+k-1}{k}}$. In the whole paper, for the seek of brevity we use the abbreviations $\mathcal{M} \equiv N \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \binom{n+k-1}{k}$ and $\mathcal{N} \equiv N\binom{n+m-1}{m}$. With this notation we have $D^m u(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}}$ and $\delta u(x) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$.

The functional above is supposed to have $p(x)$– growth, i.e. $p : \Omega \to (1, \infty)$ is a continuous function and

$$f(x, \xi, z) \approx \left(1 + |z|^2\right)^{p(x)/2}, \tag{1.2}$$

for all $x \in \Omega$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$ and $z \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}}$. Additionally we suppose the functional to be uniformly strictly quasiconvex (see Section 2 for the exact definition).

We call $u \in W^{m,1}_{loc}\left(\Omega, \mathbb{R}^N\right)$ a *local minimizer* of the functional $\mathcal{F}$, if

$$|D^m u|^{p(\cdot)} \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega), \tag{1.3}$$

and

$$\int_{\operatorname{supp}\varphi} f\left(x, \delta u, D^m u\right)\, dx \le \int_{\operatorname{supp}\varphi} f\left(x, \delta u + \delta\varphi, D^m u + D^m \varphi\right)\, dx, \tag{1.4}$$

for all $\varphi \in W^{m,1}_0\left(\Omega; \mathbb{R}^N\right)$ with $|D^m \varphi|^{p(\cdot)} \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$ and $\operatorname{supp}\varphi \Subset \Omega$.

We will prove that under additional continuity assumptions on the functional with respect to the first and second variable and provided the exponent function p is Hölder continuous, the minimizer u is regular on an open set $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$ of full Lebesgue measure, in the sense that $D^m u$ is Hölder continuous on Ω_0.

Date: February 2, 2008.

Key to the proof is an estimate for the so–calles excess Φ, which is defined by

$$\Phi^2(x_0,\rho) \equiv \fint_{B(x_0,\rho)} \Big| V_{p_2}(D^m u) - \left(V_{p_2}(D^m u)\right)_{x_0,\rho} \Big|^2 \, dx,$$

with $V_p : \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}} \to \mathbb{R}^{\mathbb{N}},\ z \mapsto \left(1+|z|^2\right)^{\frac{p-2}{4}} z$ and where p_2 is the maximal exponent on a suitable ball. The function Φ provides an integral measure for the oscillations of $D^m u$ in the ball B_ρ. A decay estimate for Φ — which can be shown under certain initial smallness conditions on Φ — leads to Hölder continuity of $D^m u$ via the integral characterization of Hölder continuous functions due to Campanato (see [5]). The excess– decay estimate will be proved by the 'blow–up' technique: Supposing that the excess–decay estimate does not hold, but the excess Φ is initially small, one finds a suitable blow–up sequence converging to the solution of a 'frozen' problem, which turns out to satisfy a 'good' estimate, whereas the 'bad' estimate from the beginning carries over to the elements of the blow–up sequence. This finally leads to a contradiction, provided that the convergence of the blow–up sequence is strong enough.

The proof of this regularity theorem is one part of the authors Ph.D. thesis (see [17]). It follows the ideas of Acerbi & Mingione [3], who proved the result for first order functionals of the type

$$\mathcal{F}[u] := \int_\Omega f(x, Du)\, dx.$$

Nevertheless there are some additional difficulties to overcome due to the higher order case and the dependence of the integrand on lower order derivatives $D^k u$ $(k = 0, \dots, m-1)$.

As mentioned above, in order to show an excess decay estimate, the minimizer of the original problem will be 'compared' to the solution of a corresponding 'frozen' problem. Since the frozen problem turns out to be a system of linear PDEs with constant coefficients, its solution can be shown — as in the first order case — to be smooth and satisfy a suitable estimate.

However additional difficulties come up by the choice of the blow–up sequence. In order to guarantee the convergence of a subsequence, one needs to assume the boundedness of alle mean values $(D^k u)_{x_0,R},\ k = 0, \dots, m$ on the ball $B(x_0, R)$. This leads to an explicit restriction on the regular set Ω_0.

On the other hand, for proving a priori higher integrability of $D^m u$, one needs a suitable Caccioppoli inequality. Therefore it will be necessary to test by a function φ which is an element of the space $W_0^{m,p}$, i.e. for which the mean values of all derivatives $D^k\varphi$ up to order $m-1$ vanish. Therefore the test function has the form $\eta^{mp}(u-P)$, where η is a cut–off function and P denotes the unique polynomial of order $m-1$ whose coefficients are chosen to satisfy

$$\fint_{B_\rho} D^k(u-P)\, dx = 0, \qquad \text{for}\ \ k = 0, 1, \dots, m-1.$$

Existence and uniqueness of such polynomials are well known and can be found for example in [16].

The author should mention that for the sake of brevitiy, some of the proofs of the preliminary statements are shortened very much. At many points there are only pointed out the differences to the first order case. All of the statements are proved in a careful and extensive way in [17].

Acknowledgements. I would like to thank Prof. Dr. Frank Duzaar and Prof. Dr. Giuseppe Mingione for encouraging me to study this kind of regularity problems and for the fruitful and intensive discussions about functionals with $p(x)$– growth.

2. Notations and Setting

We consider minimizers $u \in W^{m,1}_{loc}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ of the functional $\mathcal{F}$, where the integrand function f is a Carathéodory function which satisfies the growth condition

$$L^{-1}\left(\mu^2+|z|^2\right)^{\frac{p(x)}{2}} \le f(x,\xi,z) \le L\left(\mu^2+|z|^2\right)^{\frac{p(x)}{2}}, \tag{2.1}$$

for all $x \in \Omega$, $\xi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$, $z \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}}$, and f is uniformly strictly quasiconvex with respect to the third variable, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_Q (f(x_0,\xi_0,z_0+D^m\varphi)-f(x_0,\xi_0,z_0))\,dx, \\ &\qquad \ge \frac{1}{L}\int_Q \left(\mu^2+|z_0|^2+|D^m\varphi|^2\right)^{\frac{p(x_0)-2}{2}} |D^m\varphi|^2\,dx, \end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

for all $z_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}}, x_0 \in \Omega, \xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}, \varphi \in C_0^\infty\left(Q,\mathbb{R}^N\right)$ with $0<\mu\le 1$ and $L \ge 1$. Here $Q = (]0,1[)^n$ denotes the unit cube in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

Furthermore we demand a continuity condition in the first variable of f of the type

$$\begin{aligned} &|f(x,\xi,z)-f(x_0,\xi,z)| \\ &\le L\omega_1(|x-x_0|)\left(\left(\mu^2+|z|^2\right)^{\frac{p(x)}{2}}+\left(\mu^2+|z|^2\right)^{\frac{p(x_0)}{2}}\right)\cdot\left(1+\left|\log\left(\mu^2+|z|^2\right)\right|\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

for all $x, x_0 \in \Omega, \xi \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}, z \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}}$. $\omega_1 : (0,\infty) \to (0,\infty)$ denotes the modulus of continuity of the function p, i.e. ω_1 is non decreasing, concave, continuous and

$$\lim_{R\downarrow 0}\omega_1(R) = 0, \tag{2.4}$$

as well as

$$|p(x)-p(y)| \le \omega_1(|x-y|). \tag{2.5}$$

Finally we suppose the function f to be continuous in the second variable, i.e.

$$|f(x,\xi,z)-f(x,\xi_0,z)| \le L\omega_2(|\xi-\xi_0|)\left(\mu^2+|z|^2\right)^{\frac{p(x)}{2}} \tag{2.6}$$

for all $\xi,\xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}, x \in \Omega, z \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}}$. Without loss of generality we assume that ω_2 is concave, bounded and therefore subadditive.

The main statement is the following

Theorem 2.1. *Let $u \in W^{m,1}_{loc}\left(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N\right)$ be a local minimizer of the functional $\mathcal{F}$, where f denotes a function of the class C^2 with respect to the variable z, which satisfies the growth, quasiconvexity and continuity assumptions (2.1) to (2.6). Furthermore let $\alpha \in (0,1]$ and the moduli of continuity ω_1 and ω_2 satisfy*

$$\omega_1(R)+\omega_2(R) \le LR^\alpha, \tag{2.7}$$

for all radii $R \le 1$. Then there exists an open subset $\Omega_0 \subset \Omega$ of full measure, i.e. $\mathcal{L}^n(\Omega\setminus\Omega_0)=0$, such that $D^m u$ is locally Hölder continuous in Ω_0 for some Hölder exponent. ■

Remark. The regularity result stated in Theorem 2.1 does not assume any further growth assumptions, especially not on the second derivatives of the integrand function f.

If (2.1) holds, condition (2.2) implies the following growth condition for the first derivative Df (if it exists):

$$|Df(x_0,\xi_0,z)| \le c(1+|z|)^{p(x_0)-1}, \tag{2.8}$$

with a constant $c \equiv c(L,p(x_0))$, for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}}$ and $x_0 \in \Omega, \xi_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$. Additionally if $1<\gamma_1 \le p(x_0) \le \gamma_2 < +\infty$, then the constant c depends only on n and γ_2. ■

Remarks on the notation. In the whole paper $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n, (n \geq 2)$ denotes a bounded domain in the space $\mathbb{R}^n$ and $B(x,R) \equiv B_R(x)$ the open ball $\{y \in \mathbb{R}^n : \ |x-y| < R\}$. The Lebesgue measure of a measurable set A is abbreviated by $|A| \equiv \mathcal{L}^n(A)$. For a locally integrable function $u \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$ we define the mean value on the ball B by

$$(u)_{x_0,R} := \fint_{B(x_0,R)} u(x)\,dx = \frac{1}{|B(x_0,R)|}\int_{B(x_0,R)} u(x)\,dx.$$

In the case the centre of the ball is obvious from the context, we will often just write B_R or B instead of $B(x_0,R)$, $(u)_R$ instead of $(u)_{x_0,R}$ respectively.

The letter c denotes a constant which will not necessarily be the same at different places in the work and which may sometimes change from line to line. Constants that will be referred to at other points of the work, will be signed in a unique way, mostly by different indices. In the case we want to emphasise the fact that a constant changes from one line to another, we will label this by mathematical accents, as for example $\tilde{c}$ or $\bar{c}$. For the survey we will not specify the dependencies of the constants in between the estimates, but of course at the end of them.

For $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n, p > 1$, let $L^p(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ be the well known Lebesgue space to the power p. For $m \in \mathbb{N}$ we define the Sobolev space

$$W^{m,p}\left(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N\right) := \left\{u \in L^p\left(\Omega,\mathbb{R}^N\right) : D^\alpha u \in L^p(\Omega) \text{ for } 0 \leq |\alpha| \leq m\right\},$$

with the multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_n) \in \mathbb{N}^n$ and the abbreviations $|\alpha| := \alpha_1 + \ldots + \alpha_n$ and $D^\alpha u := D_1^{\alpha_1}\ldots D_n^{\alpha_n} u$. Furthermore let $W_0^{m,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ denote the closure of $C^\infty(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$ in the space $W^{m,p}(\Omega;\mathbb{R}^N)$.

3. Basic tools and preliminary results

3.1. **General assumptions.** For the whole paper we will assume that

$$\limsup_{R\downarrow 0} \omega_1(R) \log\frac{1}{R} < \infty, \tag{3.1}$$

which is a weaker condition than condition (2.7). Therefore without loss of generality we can also assume, that for all $R \in (0,1]$ there holds

$$\omega_1(R)\log\frac{1}{R} \leq L, \tag{3.2}$$

where L is the constant from the growth condition (2.1). As all our results are local, we can furthermore assume that

$$1 < \gamma_1 \leq p(x) \leq \gamma_2 \quad < \quad \infty \qquad \text{for all } \ x \in \Omega, \tag{3.3}$$

$$\int_\Omega |D^m u|^{p(x)}\,dx \quad < \quad \infty. \tag{3.4}$$

3.2. **Higher integrability results.**

3.2.1. **Higher integrability of $|D^m u|^{p(\cdot)}$.** First we prove higher integrability for $|D^m u|^{p(\cdot)}$. A similar result for first order functionals $(m=1)$ was shown in [3].

Lemma 3.1. *Let $O \subset \Omega$ be open and $u \in W^{m,1}_{loc}\left(O,\mathbb{R}^N\right)$ a local minimizer of the functional*

$$w \mapsto \int_O f\left(x, \delta w(x), D^m w(x)\right)\,dx, \tag{3.5}$$

where $f : O \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}} \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}} \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfies the growth and continuity assumptions (2.1) and (2.3). Furthermore assume that

$$\int_O |D^m u|^{p(x)}\,dx \leq M < \infty. \tag{3.6}$$

Then there exist $\delta, c \equiv \delta, c\,(n, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, L, M, m) > 0$ and a radius $R_0 \equiv R_0(n, \gamma_1, \omega(\cdot))$, such that for every ball $B_R \Subset O$ with $R \le R_0$ there holds:

$$\left(\fint_{B_{\frac{R}{2}}} |D^m u|^{p(x)(1+\delta)}\, dx \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\delta}} \le c \left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m u|^{p(x)}\, dx + 1 \right). \tag{3.7}$$

■

Proof. The proof of this result is more or less standard. Therefore we will show only the main steps, especially pointing out the additional difficulties in the higher order case.

Let $t, s \in (0,1)$ be such that $\frac{R}{2} < t < s < R \le 1$ and moreover

$$p_1 := \min \{ p(x) : x \in B_{4R} \}, \qquad p_2 := \max \{ p(x) : x \in B_{4R} \}. \tag{3.8}$$

We choose a cut-off function $\eta \in C_c^\infty (B_R)$ with the following properties:

$$0 \le \eta \le 1 \quad \text{on} \quad B_R, \qquad \eta \equiv 0 \quad \text{outside } B_s, \qquad \eta \equiv 1 \quad \text{on} \quad B_t, \tag{3.9}$$

$$\left| D^k \eta \right| \le \frac{c_{co}(m)}{(s-t)^k} \qquad \text{for all} \quad k = 1, \ldots, m. \tag{3.10}$$

Furthermore we set

$$\varphi(x) := \eta(x) \left(u(x) - P(x) \right), \tag{3.11}$$

where $P : \Omega \to \mathbb{R}^N$ denotes the unique polynomial of degree $m-1$ which satisfies

$$\left(D^k (u-P) \right)_R \equiv \fint_{B_R} D^k (u-P)\, dx = 0 \qquad \text{for} \quad k = 0, \ldots, m-1. \tag{3.12}$$

Finally we define

$$v := u - \varphi = u - \eta\,(u-P) = (1-\eta)\,u + \eta P. \tag{3.13}$$

Then we have $v \equiv u$ on $B_R \setminus B_s$, $v \equiv P$ on B_t. By the growth condition (2.1), minimality of u and the definition of v we easily see

$$\int_{B_t} |D^m u|^{p(x)}\, dx \le L^2 \int_{B_s} \Big(|D^m (u - \eta\,(u-P))|^{p(x)} + 1 \Big)\, dx.$$

We further estimate the right hand side, using the definition of the cuf–off function and the global bounds (3.3) of the exponent function, which yields

$$\int_{B_t} |D^m u|^{p(x)}\, dx \le c \left[\int_{B_s \setminus B_t} |D^m u|^{p(x)}\, dx + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \int_{B_s} \left| \frac{D^{m-k}(u-P)}{(t-s)^k} \right|^{p_2} dx + |B_R| \right],$$

with a constant $c \equiv c(m, \gamma_2, L)$. With the standard 'hole filling' technique and application of Lemma 3.7 we end up with

$$\int_{B_{\frac{R}{2}}} |D^m u|^{p(x)}\, dx \le c \left[\sum_{k=1}^{m} \int_{B_R} \left| \frac{D^{m-k}(u-P)}{R^k} \right|^{p_2} dx + |B_R| \right].$$

By the choice of our polynomials P we are in a position to apply Poincaré's inequality iteratively to the integrals on the right hand side, which finally leads us to the following Caccioppoli–type inequality:

$$\fint_{B_{\frac{R}{2}}} |D^m u|^{p(x)}\, dx \le c_3 \left[\fint_{B_R} \left| \frac{D^{m-1}(u-P)}{R} \right|^{p_2} dx + 1 \right], \tag{3.14}$$

with a constant $c \equiv c(n, m, L, \gamma_2)$. Now we proceed exactly in the same way as shown in [3], first applying Sobolev-Poincaré's inequality to the right hand side, then choosing $\vartheta := \min\{ \sqrt{\frac{n+1}{n}}, \gamma_1 \}$

and 'localizing', i.e. choosing the radius R so small that $\omega(8R) \leq \vartheta - 1$, which allows us to pass over from p_2 to the variable exponent $p(x)$. In conclusion we end up with a reverse Hölder inequality of the following type:

$$\fint_{B_{\frac{R}{2}}} |D^m u|^{p(x)}\, dx \leq c \left[\left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m u|^{\frac{p(x)}{\vartheta}}\, dx \right)^{\vartheta} + 1 \right], \tag{3.15}$$

for all $B_R \Subset \Omega$ with $8R \leq 1,\ \omega\left(8R\right) \leq \vartheta - 1$, where $\vartheta \equiv \min\left\{\gamma_1, \sqrt{\frac{n+1}{n}}\right\}$, $c \equiv c\left(n, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, L, M, m\right)$.

Now let R_0 be the maximal R with these properties, thus $8R_0 \leq 1,\ \omega\left(8R_0\right) \leq \vartheta - 1$, i.e. $R_0 = R_0\left(n, \gamma_1, \omega(\cdot)\right)$. Then (3.15) holds for any $B_R \Subset \Omega$ with $R \leq R_0$. The statement of the lemma follows by an application of Gehring's lemma (see [15, Chapter V]) with $f \equiv |D^m u|^{p(x)}$. □

3.2.2. **An up–to–the–boundary higher integrability result.** The following result up to the boundary is stated in [3] and we will follow the ideas from there, whereas we should mention that the statement which is proved here is slightely better, since we end up with the same radius of the balls on both sides of the inequality. This is due to a global version of the Gehring lemma, stated in [8].

Lemma 3.2. *Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ be an open set, p a constant exponent, $1 \leq \gamma_1 \leq p \leq \gamma_2$, $R > 0$, $B_R \subset \Omega$. Further let $g : \Omega \times \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}} \to \mathbb{R}$ be continuous such that*

$$L^{-1}|z|^p \leq g(x,z) \leq L\left(|z|^p + a(x)\right), \tag{3.16}$$

for all $z \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}}$ with $L \geq 1$, $0 < a \in L^{\gamma}\left(B_R\right)$ for some $\gamma > 1$. For given $h \in W^{m,q}\left(B_R\right)$ with $q > p$, let v be the solution of the minimization problem

$$\min\left\{ \int_{B_R} g\left(x, D^m w\right) dx, \quad w \in h + W_0^{m,p}\left(B_R\right) \right\}. \tag{3.17}$$

Then there exists $\varepsilon = \varepsilon\left(n, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, L, m\right) \in\ ]0, \tilde{m}[$ with $\tilde{m} = \min\left\{\gamma - 1, \frac{q}{p} - 1\right\}$ and a constant c depending only on $n, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, L, m$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} \fint_{B_R} |D^m v|^{p(1+\varepsilon)}\, dx \leq c &\left[\left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m v|^p\, dx \right)^{1+\varepsilon} \right. \\ &\left. + \left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m h|^{p(1+\tilde{m})}\, dx \right)^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1+\tilde{m}}} + \left(\fint_{B_R} a^{1+\tilde{m}}\, dx \right)^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1+\tilde{m}}} \right]. \end{aligned} \tag{3.18}$$

■

Proof. We distinguish the interior situation and the situation on the boundary. In the interior situation $B_\rho = B_\rho(x_0) \subset B_R$ the proof is similar to the proof of Lemma 3.1 . It is even more simple since the exponent p is constant. Proceeding in the standard way and additionally using Poincaré's inequality in the same way as in the proof of Lemma 3.1 , we end up with the following Caccioppoli–inequality:

$$\fint_{B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}} |D^m v|^p\, dx \leq c \left[\fint_{B_\rho} \left| \frac{D^{m-1}\left(v - P\right)}{\rho} \right|^p dx + \fint_{B_\rho} a\, dx \right],$$

with $c \equiv c(n, L, m, \gamma_2)$.

In the boundary situation $B_\rho = B_\rho(x_0)$ with $x_0 \in \partial B_R$ we proceed in the following way: Let $\frac{\rho}{2} < t < s < \rho$ and η a cut–off function as in the proof of Lemma 3.1 (of course we have to take ρ instead of R here). We define

$$w := v - \eta(v - h).$$

Then there holds $w = v$ on ∂B_ρ and on $B_\rho \setminus B_s$ and $w = h$ on B_t. Furthermore by (3.17) we have $D^k v = D^k h$ on ∂B_R for $k = 0, \dots, m-1$. Therefore by minimality of v, the imposed boundary condition, the imposed growth condition and the special form of the function w we obtain, after again applying the 'hole filling' technique and using again Lemma 3.7, the estimate (Note that we use the notation $B_r^+ := B_r \cap B_R$)

$$\int_{B^+_{\frac{\rho}{2}}} |D^m v|^p \, dx \le c \left[\sum_{k=1}^{m} \int_{B_\rho^+} \left| \frac{D^{m-k}(v-h)}{\rho^k} \right|^p dx + \int_{B_\rho^+} |D^m h|^p + \int_{B_\rho^+} a \, dx \right],$$

with $c \equiv c(m, L, \gamma_2)$. Now we define the function

$$\tilde{v} := \begin{cases} D^{m-k}(v-h) & \text{on } B_\rho^+, \\ 0 & \text{on } B_\rho \setminus B_\rho^+. \end{cases}$$

Since $v - h \in W_0^{m,p}(B_R)$, we can iteratively apply Poincaré's inequality in the version of [26], Corollary 4.5.3, to $\tilde{v}$ in combination with Hölder's inequality to conclude with the following Caccioppoli–inequality at the boundary:

$$\fint_{B^+_{\frac{\rho}{2}}} |D^m v|^p \, dx \le c \left[\fint_{B_\rho^+} \left| \frac{D^{m-1}(v-h)}{\rho} \right|^p dx + \fint_{B_\rho^+} |D^m h|^p \, dx + \fint_{B_\rho^+} a \, dx \right]. \tag{3.19}$$

To conclude inequalities of reverse Hölder type, we estimate in the interior situation via Sobolev-Poincaré's and Hölder's inequalities in the standard way. In the situation at the boundary we define

$$\tilde{v} := \begin{cases} D^{m-1}(v-h) & \text{on} \quad B_\rho^+, \\ 0 & \text{on} \quad B_\rho^- := B_\rho \setminus B_\rho^+, \end{cases}$$

and apply the Sobolev-Poincaré inequality in the version of [26, Corollary 4.5.3, p. 452] to obtain (note that $|B_\rho^-| \ge 1/2 |B_\rho|$)

$$\begin{aligned} \int_{B_\rho^+} \left| D^{m-1}(v-h) \right|^p dx &= \int_{B_\rho} |\tilde{v}|^p \, dx \le c \frac{|B_\rho|}{|B_\rho^-|} \left(\int_{B_\rho} |D\tilde{v}|^{\frac{np}{n+p}} \, dx \right)^{\frac{n+p}{n}} \\ &\le c \left(\int_{B_\rho^+} |D^m (v-h)|^{\frac{np}{n+p}} \, dx \right)^{\frac{n+p}{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

with $c \equiv c(n, \gamma_2)$. Substituting this into (3.19) and subsequently applying Hölder's inequality we finally end up with the following reverse Hölder inequalities:

$$\fint_{B^+_{\frac{\rho}{2}}} |D^m v|^p \, dx \le \tilde{c} \left[\left(\fint_{B_\rho^+} |D^m v|^{p\chi} \, dx \right)^{1/\chi} + \fint_{B_\rho^+} (|D^m h|^p + a) \, dx \right], \tag{3.20}$$

and

$$\fint_{B_{\frac{\rho}{2}}} |D^m v|^p \, dx \le \tilde{c} \left[\left(\fint_{B_\rho} |D^m v|^{p\chi} \, dx \right)^{1/\chi} + \fint_{B_\rho} a \, dx \right], \tag{3.21}$$

with $\tilde{c} \equiv \tilde{c}(n, m, L, \gamma_2)$ and $\chi \equiv \frac{n}{n+p} < 1$. Note that (3.20) holds for $\rho \le R$ and (3.21) for all $B_\rho \subset B_R$. Therefore we can apply the global version of the Gehring lemma in [8, Theorem 2.4], with the functions

$$\begin{aligned} g &:= |D^m v|^{p\chi}, \\ f &:= (|D^m h|^p + a)^\chi \end{aligned}$$

This guarantees the existence of $\varepsilon \equiv \varepsilon(n,p,m,L,k_\Omega) \in]0,\tilde{m}[$ with $\tilde{m} := \min\left\{\gamma-1, \frac{q}{p}-1\right\}$ such that

$$\left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m v|^{p\chi\tilde{q}}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{\tilde{q}}} \le c\left[\left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m v|^p\,dx\right)^{\chi} + \left(\fint_{B_R} (|D^m h|^p + a)^{\chi\tilde{q}}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{\tilde{q}}}\right],$$

for all $\tilde{q} \in \left[\frac{1}{\chi}, \frac{1}{\chi}(1+\varepsilon)\right]$, with $c \equiv c(n,m,L,p)$. Choosing $\tilde{q} := \frac{1}{\chi}(1+\varepsilon)$ and raising the resulting inequality to the power $(\chi p)^{-1}$ yields the desired estimate.

Remark. As one can easily deduce from the proof of Theorem 2.4 in [8], the constant in the estimate above can be replaced by a constant depending only on n, m, L, γ_1 and γ_2.

□

3.2.3. **Higher integrability for an almost minimizer.** The following lemma will be needed to have higher integrability for the comparison function in the blow–up procedure, obtained by Ekeland's principle. The result in first order case can be found in [6] for the case $1 < p < 2$ and in [1] for the case $p \ge 2$. Since the proof in the higher order case is only a slight modification of the proofs in case of first order, we do not give it here and refer the reader to [17] for a detailed discussion.

Lemma 3.3. *Let p be constant, $1 < \gamma_1 \le p \le \gamma_2$, $\tilde{L} > 1$, $0 < \lambda < 1$ and $g : \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}} \to \mathbb{R}$ be a continuous function satisfying the following conditions:*

$$|g(z)| \le \tilde{L}\left(1+\lambda^2|z|^2\right)^{\frac{p-2}{2}}|z|^2 = \tilde{L}\lambda^{-2}|V_p(\lambda z)|^2, \tag{3.22}$$

$$\int_{B_1} g(D^m\varphi)\,dx \ge \tilde{L}^{-1}\int_{B_1}\lambda^{-2}|V_p(\lambda D^m\varphi)|^2\,dx, \tag{3.23}$$

for all $\varphi \in W_0^{m,p}(B_1;\mathbb{R}^N)$. Moreover let $0 < \mu < 1$ and $\bar{u} \in W^{m,p}(B_1;\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that there holds

$$\int_{B_1} g(D^m\bar{u})\,dx \le \int_{B_1}\left(g(D^m\bar{u}+D^m\varphi) + \mu|D^m\varphi|\right)dx, \tag{3.24}$$

for all $\varphi \in W_0^{m,p}(B_1;\mathbb{R}^N)$. Then there exist constants $c, \delta_2 \equiv c, \delta_2(n,N,m,\gamma_1,\gamma_2,\tilde{L})$ independent of $R, \lambda, \bar{u}, g, \mu$ such that for every ball $B_{3R} \subset B_1$ there holds

$$\left(\fint_{B_{\frac{R}{2}}} |V_p(\lambda D^m\bar{u})|^{2(1+\delta_2)}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1}{1+\delta_2}} \le c\fint_{B_{3R}}\left(\lambda^2\mu + |V_p(\lambda D^m\bar{u})|^2\right)dx. \tag{3.25}$$

■

3.2.4. **Technical Lemma.** The following technical lemma, concerning the Taylor approximation of the function f in the point x_0 will be needed later in the proof of the main theorem. For the proof we refer the reader to [17].

Lemma 3.4. *Let $M > 1$. For $x_0 \in \Omega$, $U = (U_1,\dots,U_m) \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}, A \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}}$ with $|A| \le M, |U_i| \le M$ $(i = 1,\dots,m)$ and $\lambda > 0$ let*

$$f_{U,A,\lambda}(\zeta) := \lambda^{-2}\left[f(x_0,U,A+\lambda\zeta) - f(x_0,U,A) - \lambda Df(x_0,U,A)\zeta\right],$$

where the function f satisfies (2.1) *and* (2.2). *Then there exists a constant $\bar{L} \equiv \bar{L}(\gamma_1,\gamma_2,L,M)$ such that*

$$a)\quad f_{U,A,\lambda}(\zeta) \le \bar{L}\left(1+\lambda^2|\zeta|^2\right)^{\frac{p(x_0)-2}{2}}|\zeta|^2 = \bar{L}\lambda^{-2}\left|V_{p(x_0)}(\lambda\zeta)\right|^2,$$

$$b)\quad \int_{B_1} f_{U,A,\lambda}(D^m\varphi)\,dx \ge \bar{L}^{-1}\int_{B_1}\lambda^{-2}\left|V_{p(x_0)}(\lambda D^m\varphi)\right|^2\,dx,$$

for all $\varphi \in W_0^{m,p(x_0)}\left(B_1;\mathbb{R}^N\right)$. ■

3.3. **Ekeland variational principle.** The following lemma will play a central role in the proof of the main theorem. In the blow–up procedure we will need this variational principle to compare the minimizer u to an almost minimizer of a suitable 'frozen' problem. The lemma is cited from [10].

Lemma 3.5. *Let* $(\mathcal{X},d)$ *be a complete metric space and* $\mathcal{G}:\mathcal{X}\to(-\infty,+\infty]$ *a lower semicontinuous functional such that* $\inf_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{G}$ *is finite. Given* $\varepsilon>0$ *let* $u\in\mathcal{X}$ *be such that* $\mathcal{G}(u)\le\inf_{\mathcal{X}}\mathcal{G}+\varepsilon$. *Then there exists* $w\in\mathcal{X}$ *such that*

$$\begin{aligned} d(w,u) &\le 1,\\ \mathcal{G}(w) &\le \mathcal{G}(u),\\ \mathcal{G}(w) &\le \mathcal{G}(v)+\varepsilon d(v,w), \quad \text{for any } v\in\mathcal{X}. \end{aligned}$$

3.4. **The function V_p.** Let the function $V\equiv V_p:\mathbb{R}^l\to\mathbb{R}^k$ be defined by

$$V_p(z)=\left(1+|z|^2\right)^{\frac{p-2}{4}}z. \tag{3.26}$$

We recall algebraic properties of the function V_p (for a proof of the properties see e.g. [6]).

Lemma 3.6. *Let* $p>1$ *and let* $V\equiv V_p:\mathbb{R}^k\to\mathbb{R}^k$ *be as in* (3.26). *Then for any* $z,\eta\in\mathbb{R}^k$

i) $|V(tz)|\le\max\{t,t^{p/2}\}|V(z)|$, *for any* $t>0$;
ii) $|V(z+\eta)|\le c\Big(|V(z)|+|V(\eta)|\Big)$;
iii)

$$c^{-1}|z-\eta|\le\frac{|V(z)-V(\eta)|}{(1+|z|^2+|\eta|^2)^{(p-2)/4}}\le c|z-\eta|;$$

Moreover for any $z\in\mathbb{R}^k$

iv)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } p\in(1,2):&\quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\min\{|z|,|z|^{p/2}\}\le|V(z)|\le\min\{|z|,|z|^{p/2}\},\\ \text{if } p\ge 2:&\quad \max\{|z|,|z|^{p/2}\}\le|V(z)|\le\sqrt{2}\max\{|z|,|z|^{p/2}\}, \end{aligned}$$

v)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } p\in(1,2):&\quad |V(z)-V(\eta)|\le c|V(z-\eta)|, \quad \text{for any } \eta\in\mathbb{R}^k\\ \text{if } p\ge 2:&\quad |V(z)-V(\eta)|\le c(M)|V(z-\eta)|, \quad \text{for } |\eta|\le M \end{aligned}$$

vi)

$$\begin{aligned} \text{if } p\in(1,2):&\quad |V(z-\eta)|\le c(M)|V(z)-V(\eta)|, \quad \text{for } |\eta|\le M\\ \text{if } p\ge 2:&\quad |V(z-\eta)|\le c|V(z)-V(\eta)|, \quad \text{for any } \eta\in\mathbb{R}^k \end{aligned}$$

with $c(M),c\equiv c(k,p)>0$. *If* $1<\gamma_1\le p\le\gamma_2$ *all the constants* $c(k,p)$ *may be replaced by a single constant* $c\equiv c(k,\gamma_1,\gamma_2)$.

3.5. **Technical Lemma II.** We now formulate a technical lemma wich is — in a little more particular version — shown in [20]. We will need this lemma in several points of the proof of the main theorem, especially for example when proving Caccioppoli type inequalities by the 'hole filling' technique. For the proof in this general situation we again refer the reader to [17].

Lemma 3.7. *Let* $p\ge 1$ *be constant,* $K\in\mathbb{N}$, $\mathcal{V}_p:\mathbb{R}^K\to\mathbb{R}^K$ *any function for which holds*

$$|\mathcal{V}_p(y+z)| \le c\left(|\mathcal{V}_p(y)|+|\mathcal{V}_p(z)|\right) \quad \text{for all } y,z\in\mathbb{R}^K \tag{3.27}$$

$$|\mathcal{V}_p(tz)| \le \max\{t,t^{p/2}\}|\mathcal{V}_p(z)| \quad \text{for all } z\in\mathbb{R}^K, t\in\mathbb{R} \tag{3.28}$$

with a constant $c \equiv c(p,K) > 0$. *Moreover let* $0<\theta<1, A_k \geq 0, a_k > 0$ *for* $k=0,\dots l$, $B \geq 0$ *and* $f \geq 0$ *be a bounded function satisfying*

$$f(t) \leq \theta f(s) + \sum_{k=0}^{l} A_k \int_{B_R} \left| \mathcal{V}_p\left(\frac{h_k(x)}{(s-t)^{a_k}}\right)\right|^2 dx + B \tag{3.29}$$

for all $r<t<s<R$, *where* $h_k \in L^p(B_R)$ *for all* $k=0,\dots,l$. *Then there exists a constant* $c \equiv c(p,\theta,a_0,\dots,a_l)$ *such that*

$$f(r) \leq c \sum_{k=0}^{l} A_k \int_{B_R} \left| \mathcal{V}_p\left(\frac{h_k(x)}{(R-r)^{a_k}}\right)\right|^2 dx + B \tag{3.30}$$

■

3.6. **Lower order derivatives.** The following lemma will enable us to estimate the L^p- distance between the term $\delta u(x)$, consisting of the derivatives of u up to order $m-1$ and the mean value $(\delta u)_\rho$ on the ball B_ρ by the $W^{m,p}$-norm of u . This will be useful in several points of the proofs, utilizing the boundedness of the mean values $(D^k u)_\rho$ for $k=0,\dots m-1$.

Lemma 3.8. *Let* $p \geq 1$.*For* $\rho>0$, $x \in B_\rho(x_0)$, $u \in W^{m,p}\left(B_\rho(x_0), \mathbb{R}^N\right)$ *and*

$$\delta u(x) := \left(u(x), Du(x), \dots, D^{m-1}u(x)\right) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}^{nN} \times \dots \times \mathbb{R}^{N\binom{n+m-2}{m-1}}$$

the vector whose j *th component contains the* j *th weak derivative of the function* u *in the point* $x \in B_\rho$. *Then there holds*

$$\fint_{B_\rho} \left|\delta u(x) - (\delta u)_\rho\right|^p dx \leq c \sum_{k=0}^{m-1}\left[\rho^{p(m-k)}\left(|D^m u|^p\right)_\rho + \sum_{l=k+1}^{m-1} \rho^{p(l-k)} \left|\left(D^l u\right)_\rho\right|^p\right],$$

with a constant $c \equiv c(n,m,p)$. ■

Proof. The proof consists of a sequence of elementary estimates which we will sketch in the sequel. Let $P_m : \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{R}^N$ be the unique polynomial of order $m-1$, satisfying

$$\fint_{B_\rho} D^k\left(u(x) - P_m(x)\right) dx = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad k=0,\dots,m-1. \tag{3.31}$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \fint_{B_\rho} \left|D^k u - \left(D^k u\right)_\rho\right|^p dx &\leq 2^{p-1}\left[\fint_{B_\rho}\left|D^k\left(u-P_m\right)\right|^p dx + \fint_{B_\rho}\left|D^k P_m - \left(D^k u\right)_\rho\right|^p dx\right] \\ &= 2^{p-1}\left[I_1 + I_2\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Poincaré's inequality, applied $m-k$ times to I_1 (note (3.31)) leads us to

$$I_1 \leq c\rho^{p(m-k)} \fint_{B_\rho} |D^m u|^p \, dx.$$

To estimate I_2, we apply the explicit representation formula for the polynomial P_m from [21]:

$$P_m(x) = \sum_{\ell=0}^{m-1}\sum_{j=0}^{\ell}\sum_{\alpha\in M^{\ell-j}} \frac{(-1)^{d(\alpha)}}{\alpha!(j-\ell)!} \fint_{B_\rho} \left(D^\ell u\right)_\rho (y-x_0)^\alpha \, dy \, (x-x_0)^j, \tag{3.32}$$

where we use the following notation: For $k \in \mathbb{N}_0$ we denote by the number $d(\alpha) = k$ the order of the multi index $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^k$. In particular $d(0)=0$. Furthermore $|\alpha| := \alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_k$ denotes the length of the multi index α. The set

$$M^j = \left\{\alpha \in \{0\} \cup \mathbb{N}^1 \cup \mathbb{N}^2 \cup \dots \cup \mathbb{N}^j : \ |\alpha| = j\right\}$$

denotes the set of all multi indices of order $\leq j$ and length j. Moreover for a multi index α of order k and $A \in \odot^{\ell}\left(\mathbb{R}^n;\mathbb{R}^N\right), \ell \geq k$ we set

$$\fint_{\Omega} A\,(x-x_o)^{\alpha}\ dx = \fint_{\Omega}\ldots\fint_{\Omega} A\,(y_1-x_0)^{\alpha_1}\ldots(y_k-x_0)^{\alpha_k}\ dy_1\ldots dy_k.$$

¿From (3.32) we immediately get by differentiation for $k<m$:

$$D^kP_m(x) = \sum_{\ell=k}^{m-1}\sum_{j=k}^{\ell}\sum_{\alpha\in M^{\ell-j}} \frac{(-1)^{d(\alpha)}j!}{\alpha!(j-\ell)!(j-k)!}\fint_{B_\rho}\left(D^{\ell}u\right)_{\rho}(y-x_0)^{\alpha}\ dy\,(x-x_0)^{j-k}.$$

Therefore we can estimate

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \fint_{B_\rho}\left|\sum_{\ell=k}^{m-1}\sum_{j=k}^{\ell}\sum_{\alpha\in M^{\ell-j}} \frac{(-1)^{d(\alpha)}j!}{\alpha!(j-\ell)!(j-k)!}\fint_{B_\rho}\left(D^{\ell}u\right)_{\rho}(y-x_0)^{\alpha}\ dy\,(x-x_0)^{j-k} - \left(D^ku\right)_{\rho}\right|^p dx \\ &= \fint_{B_\rho}\left|\sum_{\ell=k+1}^{m-1}\sum_{j=k}^{\ell}\sum_{\alpha\in M^{\ell-j}} \frac{(-1)^{d(\alpha)}j!}{\alpha!(j-\ell)!(j-k)!}\fint_{B_\rho}\left(D^{\ell}u\right)_{\rho}(y-x_0)^{\alpha}\ dy\,(x-x_0)^{j-k}\right|^p dx \\ &\leq c(p)\fint_{B_\rho}\sum_{\ell=k+1}^{m-1}\sum_{j=k}^{\ell}\sum_{\alpha\in M^{\ell-j}} \frac{j!}{\alpha!(j-\ell)!(j-k)!}\left|\left(D^{\ell}u\right)_{\rho}\right|^p\fint_{B_\rho}|y-x_0|^{p\alpha}\ dy\,|x-x_0|^{p(j-k)}\ dx. \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \fint_{B_\rho}|y-x_0|^{p\alpha}\ dx &= \fint_{B_\rho}\ldots\fint_{B_\rho}|y_1-(x_0)_1|^{p\alpha_1}\ldots\left|y_{pd(\alpha)}-(x_0)_{d(\alpha)}\right|^{p\alpha_{d(\alpha)}}\ dy_1\ldots dy_{d(\alpha)} \\ &\leq \rho^{p\alpha_1+\ldots+p\alpha_{d(\alpha)}} = \rho^{p|\alpha|} = \rho^{p(\ell-j)}, \end{aligned}$$

when $\alpha\in M^{\ell-j}$. Inserting this above we arrive at

$$I_2 \leq \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{m-1} c(\ell,k)\rho^{p(\ell-k)}\left|\left(D^{\ell}u\right)_{\rho}\right|^p.$$

Combining the estimates for I_1 and I_2 we find that

$$\fint_{B_\rho}\left|D^ku(x)-\left(D^ku\right)_{\rho}\right|^p dx \leq c\left[\rho^{p(m-k)}\left(|D^mu|^p\right)_{\rho} + \sum_{\ell=k+1}^{m-1}\rho^{p(\ell-k)}\left|\left(D^{\ell}u\right)_{\rho}\right|^p\right]$$

with $c\equiv c\,(n,p)$. The claim follows now immediately by

$$\fint_{B_\rho}\left|\delta u(x)-(\delta u)_{\rho}\right|^p dx \leq c(n,m,p)\sum_{k=0}^{m-1}\fint_{B_\rho}\left|D^ku(x)-\left(D^ku\right)_{\rho}\right|^p dx.$$

□

4. Proof of Theorem 2.1

In the whole proof u denotes the minimizer of the functional $\mathcal{F}$ as required in Theorem 2.1. The proof will be divided in several lemmas. If the function u is mentioned there, we will always assume the minimizing property of u without explicitely pointing it out again.

4.1. **Localization, choice of radii and constants.** We start by Lemma 3.1 which provides a higher integrability exponent δ_1 such that for any $\Omega' \Subset \Omega$ there holds

$$\int_{\Omega'} |D^m u|^{p(x)(1+\delta_1)}\, dx < +\infty.$$

Since all our results are local we will assume for the rest of the proof that

$$\int_{\Omega} |D^m u|^{p(x)(1+\delta_1)}\, dx < +\infty.$$

Certainly we can choose δ_1 so small such that

$$0 < \delta_1 \le \min\left\{\gamma_1 - 1, 1\right\}.$$

Now let $1 < M < \infty$ and $\bar{L} \equiv \bar{L}(M)$ be the constant given by Lemma 3.4. We define the function

$$g(z) := f_{U,A,\lambda}(z) = \lambda^{-2}\left[f\left(x_0, U, A + \lambda z\right) - f\left(x_0, U, A\right) - \lambda D f\left(x_0, U, A\right) z\right],$$

with $U = (U_1, \ldots, U_m), |U_l| \le M$ $(l = 1, \ldots, m)$ and $|A| \le M$, and find that by Lemma 3.4 the function g fulfills the assumptions for Lemma 3.3 with $p \equiv p(x_0) = \text{const}$. This yields a further higher integrability exponent $\delta_2 \equiv \delta_2(M)$. Subsequently we apply Lemma 3.2, namely with the exponent $q = p\left(1 + \delta_1/4\right)$ and the constant L replaced by $2L$ and therefore obtain an up–to–the–boundary higher integrability exponent ε, with $0 < \varepsilon < \delta_1/4$ and $\varepsilon \equiv \varepsilon(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, L, \delta_1)$.

Now we set

$$\delta_3 := \min\left\{\varepsilon, \delta_2\right\} \equiv \delta_3(M) \tag{4.1}$$

and choose a radius $R_M > 0$ such that

$$\omega_1\left(R_M\right) \le \frac{\delta_3}{4}.$$

From now on let $O \Subset \Omega$ be an open set whose diameter does not exceed R_M.

On the set O we can estimate the exponent p at any point in terms of the maximal or minimal exponent, respectively.

Therefore we set

$$p_1 := \inf\left\{p(x) :\ x \in O\right\}, \quad p_2 := \sup\left\{p(x) :\ x \in O\right\}. \tag{4.2}$$

This implies (since $p_2 - p_1 \le \omega\left(|x - x'|\right) \le \omega\left(R_M\right) \le \delta_3/4 \le \varepsilon/4 < \delta_1/16$):

$$\begin{aligned} p_2\left(1 + \delta_1/4\right) &\le p_1\left(1 + \delta_1\right) \le p(x)\left(1 + \delta_1\right), && (4.3)\\ p_2\left(1 + \delta_2/4\right) &\le p_1\left(1 + \delta_2\right) \le p(x)\left(1 + \delta_2\right), && (4.4)\\ p_2\left(1 + \varepsilon/4\right) &\le p_1\left(1 + \epsilon\right) \le p(x)\left(1 + \varepsilon\right), && (4.5)\end{aligned}$$

for all $x \in O$.

Remark. δ_3 does in fact depend on M ($\delta_3 \to 0$ as $M \to \infty$). ε is independent of M (see the dependencies of the exponent ε in Lemma 3.2 for this purpose) and stays bounded away from 0 for any M. ■

Remark. By the constraint $\operatorname{diam}(O) \le R_M$ the open set O depends on the solution u of the variational problem itself. O will be chosen in a special way at the end of the proof and it will be shown that the regular set is open. ■

4.2. **Freezing.** Now we will show that there exists a function $\breve{u}$ which is close to the minimizer u with respect to the $L^{p_2}-$ distance and which is an almost minimizer of the 'frozen' problem.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $M_1, M_2 > 0$ and $B(x_0, 4R) \Subset O$. Then there exist β_1, β_2 dependent on γ_1, γ_2, L, m and α, but independent of M_1, M_2, R and x_0 and a constant $\check{c}(M_1, M_2)$ such that the following holds: Let u be a minimizer of the functional $\mathcal{F}$ and $\left(|D^m u|^{p_2}\right)_{x_0,4R} \le M_1$, $\left|(D^k u)_{x_0,R}\right| \le M_2$, for $k = 0, \dots, m-1$, then there exists a function $\breve{u} \in u + W_0^{m,p_2}\left(B(x_0,R); \mathbb{R}^N\right)$ such that*

$$(1)\quad \fint_{B(x_0,R)} |D^m u - D^m \breve{u}|^{p_2}\, dx \le \check{c} R^{\beta_1},$$

$$(2)\quad \fint_{B(x_0,R)} f\left(x_0, (\delta u)_R, D^m \breve{u}\right) dx$$

$$\le \fint_{B(x_0,R)} f\left(x_0, (\delta u)_R, D^m w\right) dx + R^{\beta_2} \fint_{B(x_0,R)} |D^m w - D^m \breve{u}|\, dx,$$

for all $w \in u + W_0^{m,p_2}\left(B(x_0,R); \mathbb{R}^N\right)$. ■

Proof. We consider the frozen integrand

$$g(z) := f\left(x_0, (u)_R, (Du)_R, \dots, \left(D^{m-1}u\right)_R, z\right) \equiv f\left(x_0, (\delta u)_R, z\right)$$

and define $v \in u + W_0^{m,p(x_0)}\left(B_R; \mathbb{R}^N\right)$ as the unique solution of the minimization problem

$$\min \left\{ \int_{B_R} g\left(D^m w\right) dx : \; w \in u + W_0^{m,p(x_0)}\left(B_R; \mathbb{R}^N\right) \right\}.$$

The existence of v is guaranteed since the functional is quasiconvex.

HIGHER INTEGRABILITY. Applying Lemma 3.1 to the function u leads to (using (4.3))

$$\fint_{B_R} |D^m u|^{p_2(1+\delta_1/4)}\, dx \le c(M_1). \tag{4.6}$$

Now, Lemma 3.2, applied to v with $g(x,z) \equiv g(z)$, $p \equiv p(x_0)$, $h \equiv u \in W^{m,q}(B_R)$, $q \equiv p(1+\delta_1/4) > p$, $a(x) \equiv 1$ and $\tilde{m} = \delta_1/4$ provides $\varepsilon \in (0, \delta_1/4)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\fint_{B_R} |D^m v|^{p_2(1+\varepsilon/4)}\, dx \\
&\quad \le c\left[\left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m v|^{p(x_0)}\, dx\right)^{1+\epsilon} + \left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m u|^{p(x_0)(1+\delta_1/4)}\, dx\right)^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1+\delta_1/4}} + 1\right] \\
&\quad = c\left[(1) + (2) + 1\right].
\end{aligned}$$

The estimate above gives for the second integral

$$(2) \le \left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m u|^{p_2}\, dx + 1\right)^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1+\delta_1/4}} \le c(M_1).$$

For the first integral we use the minimizing property of v, combined with the growth condition of g obtaining

$$\begin{aligned}
&\left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m v|^{p(x_0)}\, dx\right)^{1+\varepsilon} \\
&\quad \le C\left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m u|^{p(x_0)}\, dx + 1\right)^{1+\varepsilon} \le \left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m u|^{p_2}\, dx + 1\right)^{1+\varepsilon} \le c(M_1).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we have

$$\fint_{B_R} |D^m v|^{p_2(1+\epsilon/4)}\, dx \le c(M_1) \tag{4.7}$$

A COMPARISON ESTIMATE. We start by splitting as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\fint_{B_R} \left[g\left(D^m u\right) - g\left(D^m v\right)\right] dx &= \fint_{B_R} \left[f\left(x_0, (\delta u)_R, D^m u\right) - f\left(x_0, (\delta u)_R, D^m v\right)\right] dx \\
&= \fint_{B_R} \left[f\left(x_0, (\delta u)_R, D^m u\right) - f\left(x_0, \delta u, D^m u\right)\right] dx \\
&\quad + \fint_{B_R} \left[f\left(x_0, \delta u, D^m u\right) - f\left(x, \delta u, D^m u\right)\right] dx \\
&\quad + \fint_{B_R} \left[f\left(x, \delta u, D^m u\right) - f\left(x, \delta u, D^m v\right)\right] dx \\
&\quad + \fint_{B_R} \left[f\left(x, \delta u, D^m v\right) - f\left(x_0, \delta u, D^m v\right)\right] dx \\
&\quad + \fint_{B_R} \left[f\left(x_0, \delta u, D^m v\right) - f\left(x_0, (\delta u)_R, D^m v\right)\right] dx \\
&= I^{(1)} + I^{(2)} + I^{(3)} + I^{(4)} + I^{(5)},
\end{aligned}$$

with the obvious notation $I^{(1)}$ – $I^{(5)}$. Subsequently we estimate $I^{(1)}$ – $I^{(5)}$.

Estimate for $I^{(3)}$: Using (1.4) and (2.6) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
I^{(3)} &\le L \fint_{B_R} \omega_2\left(|\delta v - \delta u|\right) \left(\mu^2 + |D^m v|^2\right)^{p_2/2} dx + L \fint_{B_R} \omega_2\left(|\delta v - \delta u|\right) dx \\
&= I^{(3,1)} + I^{(3,2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We handle $I^{(3,1)}$ by the higher integrability result for $D^m v$: Therefore let $r := p_2\left(1 + \tilde{\varepsilon}\right)$ with $\tilde{\varepsilon} \equiv \varepsilon/4$, and ε the exponent of (4.7). So $\tilde{\varepsilon} \in (0, \delta_1/4)$ and consequently $r \in (p_2, p_2(1+\delta_1/4))$. Thus we obtain by Hölder's inequality, the boundedness of ω_2, (4.7), Jensen's inequality and $\mu \le 1$:

$$\begin{aligned}
I^{(3,1)} &\le c \left[\fint_{B_R} \left(\mu^2 + |D^m v(x)|^2\right)^{\frac{r}{2}} dx\right]^{\frac{p_2}{r}} \left[\fint_{B_R} \omega_2^{\frac{r}{r-p_2}}\left(|\delta v(x) - \delta u(x)|\right) dx\right]^{\frac{r-p_2}{r}} \\
&\le c \left[\fint_{B_R} |D^m v|^{p_2(1+\varepsilon/4)}\, dx + 1\right]^{\frac{1}{1+\varepsilon/4}} \left[\fint_{B_R} \omega_2\left(|\delta v - \delta u|\right) dx\right]^{\frac{r-p_2}{r}} \\
&\le c(M_1) \omega_2^{\sigma}\left(\fint_{B_R} |\delta v - \delta u|\, dx\right),
\end{aligned}$$

where $\sigma \equiv \frac{r-p_2}{r} = \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{1+\tilde{\varepsilon}}$. To estimate $I^{(3,2)}$ we use once again the boundedness and concavity of ω_2 and Jensen's inequality, which together with the previous estimate for $I^{(3,1)}$ leads to

$$I^{(3)} \le c \omega_2^{\sigma}\left(\fint_{B_R} |\delta v - \delta u|\, dx\right),$$

with a constant $c \equiv c\left(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, L, n, m, M_1\right)$.

For estimating $\fint_{B_R} |\delta v - \delta u|\, dx$ we remark the following: Since $u - v \in W_0^{m,p_2}\left(B_R\right)$, we can apply Poincaré's inequality obtaining

$$\fint_{B_R} \left|D^{m-k}\left(u - v\right)\right| dx \le c R^k \fint_{B_R} \left|D^m\left(u - v\right)\right| dx,$$

and therefore with (4.6), (4.7) and $R \leq 1$:

$$\begin{aligned} ⨍_{B_R} |\delta u - \delta v| \, dx &\leq \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} ⨍_{B_R} \left| D^k (u-v) \right| \, dx \\ &\leq c \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} R^{m-k} ⨍_{B_R} |D^m (u-v)| \, dx \leq c \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} R^{m-k} \\ &\leq c(n,m,M_1)R. \end{aligned}$$

Altogether we get

$$I^{(3)} \leq c_{M_1} \omega_2^\sigma (R) , \tag{4.8}$$

with a constant $c_{M_1} \equiv c_{M_1}(n,m,L,M_1,\gamma_1,\gamma_2)$.

Estimate for $I^{(2)}$: We use (2.3) and (4.6) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} I^{(2)} \leq L ⨍_{B_R} \omega_1 (|x-x_0|) \left[\left(1+|D^m u|^2\right)^{p(x)/2} + \left(1+|D^m u|^2\right)^{p(x_0)/2} \right] \\ \cdot \left[1 + \log \left(1 + |D^m u(x)|^2 \right) \right] \, dx. \end{aligned}$$

We estimate the integrand in the following elementary way:

$$\left[\left(1+|z|^2\right)^{p(x_0)/2} + \left(1+|z|^2\right)^{p(x)/2} \right] \left(1+\log\left(1+|z|^2\right)\right) \leq c(\gamma_1,\varepsilon) \left(1+|z|^{p_2(1+\varepsilon/4)}\right).$$

Thus we end up with

$$I^{(2)} \leq c\omega_1(R) \left(⨍_{B_R} |D^m u|^{p_2(1+\varepsilon)} \, dx + 1 \right) \leq c_{M_1} \omega_1(R).$$

Estimate for $I^{(1)}$: Using (2.6), the concavity of ω_2 and (4.6), we obtain, proceeding in an analogue way to the estimate of $I^{(3)}$:

$$I^{(1)} \leq c_{M_1} \omega_2^\sigma \left(⨍_{B_R} |\delta u - (\delta u)_R| \, dx \right).$$

To estimate the integral we apply Lemma 3.8, obtaining by the boundedness of the mean values

$$I^{(1)} \leq c_{M_1} \omega_2^\sigma \left(C \sum_{k=0}^{m-1} \left[R^{m-k} c_{M_1} + \sum_{l=k+1}^{m-1} c R^{l-k} c_{M_2} \right] \right),$$

which yields

$$I^{(1)} \leq c_{M_1,M_2} \omega_2^\sigma (R) .$$

Estimate for $I^{(4)}$: Completely analogous to the estimate of $I^{(2)}$ we use (2.3) and (4.7) to find:

$$I^{(4)} \leq c\omega_1 (R) ⨍_{B_R} \left(1 + |D^m v|^{p_2(1+\varepsilon/4)} \right) dx \leq c_{M_1} \omega_1 (R) .$$

Estimate for $I^{(5)}$: This term is treated exactly as $I^{(1)}$ by using (2.6), (4.7) and the boundedness of the mean values $(D^k u)$:

$$I^{(5)} \leq c_{M_1} \omega_2^\sigma (R) .$$

Combining the estimates for $I^{(1)} - I^{(5)}$ we finally arrive at:

$$⨍_{B_R} [g(D^m u) - g(D^m v)] \, dx \leq c_{M_1,M_2} \left(\omega_1 (R) + \omega_2^\sigma (R) \right).$$

By assumption (2.7) we finally obtain for $R<1$ and by letting $\tilde{\alpha}\equiv\sigma\alpha$:

$$\fint_{B_R}\left[g\left(D^m u\right)-g\left(D^m v\right)\right]\,dx \le C\left(R^{\alpha}+R^{\sigma\alpha}\right)\le c_{M_1,M_2}R^{\tilde{\alpha}}, \tag{4.9}$$

with $\tilde{\alpha}\equiv\tilde{\alpha}\left(\alpha,\gamma_1,\gamma_2,L,m\right)$ and the constant c_{M_1,M_2} depending on $n,L,m,\gamma_1,\gamma_2,M_1,M_2$.

Remark. *Since $\sigma\equiv\sigma(\varepsilon)$ is independent of M_1,M_2, also $\tilde{\alpha}$ does not depend on M_1,M_2 (see Remark 4.1 on page 12 concerning the dependencies of ε).*

Remark. *In estimate (4.9) we used the boundedness of the mean values of $D^k u$ $(k=0,\dots,m-1)$ and of $|D^m u|^{p_2}$ on the balls B_R. However at the end of the proof we will define the regular set Ω_0 in a way that these assumptions are satisfied automatically on Ω_0.*

A FURTHER COMPARISON FUNCTION. Since the functional $\mathcal{F}$ is only quasiconvex, we cannot directly estimate the L^p–distance of $D^m u$ and $D^m v$. Therefore we apply Ekeland's variational principle providing a further function $\breve{u}$, which is close to the original minimizer u with respect to the L^{p_2}– norm, therefore not anymore a minimizer of the frozen functional, but anyway an almost–minimizer in the sense of (4.11).

We consider

$$\mathcal{X}:=u+W_0^{m,1}\left(B_R;\mathbb{R}^N\right),$$

together with

$$d:\mathcal{X}\times\mathcal{X}\to[0,\infty),\quad (z_1,z_2)\mapsto \hat{C}_M^{-1}R^{-\tilde{\alpha}/4}\fint_{B_R}\left|D^m z_1-D^m z_2\right|\,dx.$$

Then the functional

$$\mathcal{G}:\mathcal{X}\to\mathbb{R},\quad \mathcal{G}(z):=\begin{cases}\displaystyle\fint_{B_R}g\left(D^m z\right)\,dx & \text{if } z\in u+W_0^{m,p(x_0)}\left(B_R;\mathbb{R}^N\right),\\ +\infty & \text{otherwise}.\end{cases}$$

is obviously lower semicontinuous on the complete metric space $(\mathcal{X},d)$. By construction of v and (4.9) we have

$$\mathcal{G}(v)=\min_X\mathcal{G},\qquad \mathcal{G}(u)\le\inf_X\mathcal{G}+c_{M_1,M_2}R^{\tilde{\alpha}}.$$

Therefore Lemma 3.5 provides $\breve{u}\in u+W_0^{m,p(x_0)}\left(B_R;\mathbb{R}^N\right)$ satisfying

$$\fint_{B_R}\left|D^m u-D^m\breve{u}\right|\,dx \le c_{M_1,M_2}R^{\tilde{\alpha}/4}\quad\text{and} \tag{4.10}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\fint_{B_R}f\left(x_0,(\delta u)_R,D^m\breve{u}\right)\,dx &\le \fint_{B_R}f\left(x_0,(\delta u)_R,D^m w\right)\,dx\\ &\quad+R^{\frac{3\tilde{\alpha}}{4}}\fint_{B_R}\left|D^m w-D^m\breve{u}\right|\,dx,\end{aligned} \tag{4.11}$$

for all $w\in u+W_0^{m,p(x_0)}\left(B_R;\mathbb{R}^N\right)$. This proves assertion (2) with $\beta_2:=3\tilde{\alpha}/4\equiv\beta_2\left(L,m,\gamma_1,\gamma_2,\alpha\right)$.

For showing (1) we consider the functional $\bar{\mathcal{G}}:u+W_0^{m,p(x_0)}(B_R;\mathbb{R}^N)\to\mathbb{R}$ defined by

$$\bar{\mathcal{G}}(w)\equiv\fint_{B_R}f\left(x_0,(\delta u)_R,D^m w\right)\,dx+R^{3\tilde{\alpha}/4}\fint_{B_R}\left|D^m w-D^m\breve{u}\right|\,dx.$$

By (4.11) $\breve{u}$ minimizes $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$. Let

$$g(x,z):=f\left(x_0,(\delta u)_R,z\right)+R^{3\tilde{\alpha}/4}\left|z-D^m\breve{u}(x)\right|.$$

It is easy to see that the growth condition (2.1) translates into

$$\tilde{L}^{-1}|z|^{p(x_0)}\le g(x,z)\le\tilde{L}\left[|z|^{p(x_0)}+a(x)\right], \tag{4.12}$$

with $a(x) \equiv 1 + |D^m \breve{u}(x)| > 0$ and $\tilde{L} \equiv L + 1$. We apply Lemma 3.2 to the functional $\bar{\mathcal{G}}$ with $g(x,z) \equiv f\left(x_0, (\delta u)_R, z\right) + R^{3\tilde{\alpha}/4}\,|z - D^m \breve{u}|$, $p \equiv p\left(x_0\right)$, $q \equiv p\left(x_0\right)\left(1+\delta_1/4\right)$, $a \equiv |D^m \breve{u}| + 1 \in L^{\gamma_1}\left(B_R\right)$, $\gamma \equiv \gamma_1$, such that by $\tilde{m} \equiv \delta_1/4$ we obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
\fint_{B_R} |D^m \breve{u}|^{p_2(1+\varepsilon/4)}\,dx \quad &\leq \quad c\left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m \breve{u}|^{p(x_0)}\,dx\right)^{1+\varepsilon} + c\left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m u|^{p_2(1+\delta_1/4)}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1+\delta_1/4}} \\
&\qquad + c\left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m \breve{u}|^{1+\delta_1/4}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1+\varepsilon}{1+\delta_1/4}} \\
&= \quad c\left[II^{(1)} + II^{(2)} + II^{(3)}\right].
\end{aligned}
$$

By (4.11), (4.12), (4.10) and (4.6) we obtain

$$
II^{(1)} \leq c_{M_1}.
$$

By higher integrability of $D^m u$, $II^{(2)}$ is also estimated by a constant c_{M_1}. Finally Hölder's inequality leads to

$$
II^{(3)} \leq c\left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m \breve{u}|^{p(x_0)}\,dx + 1\right)^{1+\varepsilon} \leq c_{M_1}.
$$

Therefore we conclude

$$
\fint_{B_R} |D^m \breve{u}|^{p_2(1+\varepsilon/4)}\,dx \leq c_{M_1}. \tag{4.13}
$$

Now we interpolate between 1 and $p_2\left(1+\tilde{\varepsilon}\right)$ (with the definition $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \varepsilon/4$ on page 14). For $0 < \theta < \frac{1}{p_2}$ we write by using Hölder's inequality

$$
\begin{aligned}
\fint_{B_R} |D^m u - D^m \breve{u}|^{p_2}\,dx \quad &\leq \quad \left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m u - D^m \breve{u}|\,dx\right)^{p_2\theta}\left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m u - D^m \breve{u}|^{\frac{p_2(1-\theta)}{1-p_2\theta}}\,dx\right)^{1-p_2\theta} \\
&= \quad II^{(4)} \cdot II^{(5)}.
\end{aligned}
$$

By (4.10) we get for the first integral:

$$
II^{(4)} \leq \left(c_{M_1} R^{\tilde{\alpha}/4}\right)^{p_2\theta} = c_{M_1} R^{\theta\tilde{\alpha}p_2/4}.
$$

Choosing $\theta = \frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}}{p_2(1+\tilde{\varepsilon})-1} < \frac{1}{p_2}$ and using higher integrability from (4.13) and (4.6) we have (note that $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \frac{\varepsilon}{4} \leq \frac{\delta_1}{16} \leq \frac{\delta_1}{4}$):

$$
II^{(5)} \leq \left(\fint_{B_R} |D^m u - D^m \breve{u}|^{p_2(1+\tilde{\varepsilon})}\,dx\right)^{\frac{1-\theta}{1+\tilde{\varepsilon}}} \leq c_{M_1}.
$$

Thus we finally arrive at

$$
\fint_{B_R} |D^m u - D^m \breve{u}|^{p_2}\,dx \leq \breve{C}_M R^{\theta\tilde{\alpha}/4}.
$$

Noting that $\theta \geq \frac{\tilde{\epsilon}}{\gamma_2(1+\tilde{\epsilon})-1} =: \bar{\theta}$ and $R \leq 1$ we can estimate $R^{\tilde{\alpha}\theta/4}$ by $R^{\tilde{\alpha}\bar{\theta}/4}$. Wo finish the proof we choose $\beta_1 \equiv \bar{\theta}\tilde{\alpha}/4$. Note that by this choice $\beta_1 \equiv \beta_1(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, L, m, \alpha)$ is independent of M_1, M_2, since ε is so. □

4.3. Excess–Decay estimate.

We set

$$\beta := \frac{1}{2p_2}\min\{\beta_1,\beta_2\}, \tag{4.14}$$

and define the excess $\Phi(x_0,R)$ for all x_0,R with $B(x_0,4R)\Subset O$ by letting

$$\Phi(x_0,R) := \fint_{B(x_0,R)} \left|V_{p_2}(D^m u) - V_{p_2}\left((D^m u)_{x_0,R}\right)\right|^2 dx + R^\beta, \tag{4.15}$$

where V_p is the function defined in (3.26) on page 9 and p_2 is from (4.2).

We define

$$\underline{q} := \min\{2,p_2\}, \qquad Q := \max\{2,p_2\}. \tag{4.16}$$

Lemma 4.2 (Excess decay). *Let $M>1$, β from (4.14) and let $O\Subset\Omega$ be an open subset whose diameter does not exceed R_M, as explained on page 12. Then there exist a constant C_M, depending also on $n,N,m,L,\gamma_1,\gamma_2$ and for every $\tau\in(0,1/24)$ a number $\varepsilon_0\equiv\varepsilon_0(\tau,M)$, such that if*

$$\begin{gathered}\left|(D^m u)_{x_0,\tau R}\right| \le M,\\ \left|(D^k u)_{x_0,R}\right| \le M \text{ for } k=0,\dots,m, \qquad \left|(D^m u)_{x_0,4R}\right| \le M,\\ \Phi(x_0,R) < \varepsilon_0, \qquad \Phi(x_0,4R)\le 1\end{gathered} \tag{4.17}$$

hold on some $B(x_0,4R)\Subset\Omega$, then we have

$$\Phi(x_0,\tau R) \le C_M \tau^\beta \Phi(x_0,R). \tag{4.18}$$

■

Proof. We follow the ideas of [3]. Nevertheless there are some modifications due to the higher order case which we will point out in the sequel.

For the whole proof we use the abbreviations $B^{(h)}\equiv B(x_h,R_h)$ and $B_4^{(h)}\equiv B(x_h,4R_h)$, as well as $(u)_{B^{(h)}}\equiv(u)_{x_h,R_h}$, $(u)_{B_4^{(h)}}\equiv(u)_{x_h,4R_h}$ respectively.

STEP 1: BLOW UP: We prove the statement by contradiction. Therefore we assume that (4.17) holds, but (4.18) fails. Therefore there exists a sequence of balls $B(x_h,4R_h)\Subset O$, such that

$$\begin{gathered}\left|(D^m u)_{x_h,\tau R_h}\right| \le M,\\ \left|(D^k u)_{x_h,R_h}\right| \le M \text{ for } k=0,\dots,m, \qquad \left|(D^m u)_{x_h,4R_h}\right| \le M,\\ \mu_h^2 := \Phi(x_h,R_h)\to 0 \text{ as } h\to\infty, \qquad \Phi(x_h,4R_h)\le 1,\end{gathered} \tag{4.19}$$

but

$$\Phi(x_h,\tau R_h) \ge C(M)\tau^\beta\Phi(x_h,R_h), \tag{4.20}$$

where $C(M)$ will be chosen at the end of the proof. Without loss of generality we can assume that $R_h\to 0$ as $h\to\infty$. Exactly as in the first order case we see that there exists c_M such that

$$\left(|D^m u|^{p_2}\right)_{x_h,4R_h} \le c_M. \tag{4.21}$$

By assumption we also have $|(D^k u)_{x_h,R_h}|\le M$ for $k=0,\dots,m$. We are now in a position to apply Lemma 4.1 (with $M_1:=c_M$ from (4.21) and $M_2=M$ from our hypothesis), which yields a sequence of functions $u_h\in u+W_0^{m,p_2}\left(B^{(h)};\mathbb{R}^N\right)$ satisfying

$$\fint_{B^{(h)}} |D^m u - D^m u_h|^{p_2}\,dx \quad\le\quad c_M R_h^{\beta_1}, \tag{4.22}$$

$$\fint_{B^{(h)}} f\left(x_h, U_h, D^m u_h\right) dx \quad \le \quad \fint_{B^{(h)}} f\left(x_h, U_h, D^m w\right) dx + R_h^{\beta_2} \fint_{B^{(h)}} \left|D^m w - D^m u_h\right| dx, \tag{4.23}$$

for all $w \in u + W_0^{m,p_2}\left(B^{(h)};\mathbb{R}^N\right)$. We note that β_1, β_2 are independent of $h \in \mathbb{N}$ and M. Here we used the abbreviation $U_h \equiv (\delta u)_h \equiv (\delta u)_{x_h,R_h}$. We let

$$A_h := \left(D^m u\right)_{B^{(h)}}, \qquad \lambda_h^2 := \fint_{B^{(h)}} \left|V_{p_2}\left(D^m u_h\right) - V_{p_2}\left(A_h\right)\right|^2 dx + R_h^{\beta}.$$

We now rescale the functions u_h in order to obtain a sequence of functions v_h on the unit ball. Therefore let $P_h : B^{(h)} \to \mathbb{R}^N$ be the unique polynomial of degree m, for which there holds

$$\int_{B^{(h)}} D^k\left(u_h - P_h\right) dx = 0 \qquad (k = 0, \ldots, m-1), \qquad D^m P_h \equiv A_h. \tag{4.24}$$

Now, using the notation $B_1 \equiv B(0,1)$ we define the sequence of rescaled functions by

$$v_h(y) := \lambda_h^{-1} R_h^{-m}\left(u_h - P_h\right) \circ \left(x_h + R_h y\right), \ y \in B_1.$$

From (4.24) we immediately see that

$$\left(D^k v_h\right)_{0,1} = 0 \quad (k = 0, \ldots, m-1), \text{ and} \tag{4.25}$$

$$D^m v_h(y) = \lambda_h^{-1}\left[D^m u_h \circ \left(x_h + R_h y\right) - A_h\right]. \tag{4.26}$$

Additionally we see, exactly as in the first order case, that the sequences

$$\left(\left|D^m v_h\right|^{\underline{q}}\right)_{h\in\mathbb{N}} \qquad \text{and} \qquad \left(\lambda_h^{p_2-2}\left|D^m v_h\right|^{p_2}\right)_{h\in\mathbb{N}} \ \text{for } p_2 \ge 2 \tag{4.27}$$

are uniformly bounded in $L^1(B_1)$ by a constant C_M. This implies the existence of a subsequence — without loss of generality the sequence (v_h) itself — and a function $v \in W^{m,\underline{q}}\left(B_1;\mathbb{R}^N\right)$ such that

(a) $v_h \to v$ weakly in $W^{m,\underline{q}}\left(B_1;\mathbb{R}^N\right)$,
(b) $v_h \to v$ strongly in $W^{m-1,\underline{q}}\left(B_1;\mathbb{R}^N\right)$,
and therefore in particular $|v_h - v|^{\underline{q}} \to 0$ strongly in $L^1(B_1)$,
(c) $\lambda_h^{p_2-2}\left|D^k\left(v_h - v\right)\right|^{p_2} \to 0$ strongly in $L^1(B_1)$, for $k = 0, \ldots, m-1$, if $p_2 > 2$,
(d) $x_h \to x$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, with $x \in \bar{O}$,
(e) $A_h \to A$ in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}}$, with $|A| \le M$.
(f) $U_h \to U$ in $\mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$, with $U = (U_0, \ldots, U_{m-1})$ and $|U_k| \le M$ $(k = 0, \ldots, m-1)$.

Using Lemma 3.6 and Jensen's inequality and proceeding exactly as in [3] we obtain

$$\lambda_h^2 \le C_M \mu_h^2, \quad \text{and in particular} \quad \lambda_h^2 \to 0. \tag{4.28}$$

STEP 2: v SOLVES A LINEAR SYSTEM: The almost minimizing property of the functions u_h directly translates into the following Euler–Lagrange system for the rescaled functions v_h:

$$\fint_{B_1} \left\langle Df\left(x_h, U_h, A_h + \lambda_h D^m v_h\right), D^m\varphi\right\rangle dy + \lambda_h I_h^{(2)} = 0, \tag{4.29}$$

for all $\varphi \in C_0^m\left(B_1, \mathbb{R}^N\right)$, in which the second term satisfies the estimate

$$\lambda_h \left|I_h^{(2)}\right| \le R_h^{\beta_2} \fint_{B_1} \left|D^m\varphi\right| dy. \tag{4.30}$$

Since $Df(x_h, U_h, A_h) = \text{const}$, there holds additionally to the Euler–Lagrange system:

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \lambda_h^{-1} \int_{B_1} \big\langle Df\left(x_h, U_h, A_h + \lambda_h D^m v_h\right) - Df\left(x_h, U_h, A_h\right), D^m\varphi\big\rangle \, dy + (II)_h \\ &=: I_h^{(1)} + I_h^{(2)}, \end{aligned}$$

The definition of λ_h^2 and β immediately imply

$$\lambda_h^{-1} R_h^{\beta_2} \to 0 \ \text{ and therefore } \ I_h^{(2)} \to 0.$$

For estimating $I_h^{(1)}$, we proceed exactly as in [3], dividing the unit ball into $E_h^+ := \{x \in B_1 : \lambda_h |D^m v_h| \geq 1\}$ and $E_h^- := B_1 \setminus E_h^+$, respectively the integral $I_h^{(1)}$ into $I_h^{(1),+}$ and $I_h^{(1),-}$. Deducing $|E_h^+| \to 0$ by the uniform boundedness of $|D^m v_h|^{\underline{q}}$ in $L^1(B_1)$, and additionaly using the uniform boundedness of $\lambda_h^{p_2-2}|D^m v_h|^{p_2}$ in $L^1(B_1)$ in the case $p_2 \geq 2$ together with the growth properties of Df leads to

$$|I_h^{(1),+}| \to 0.$$

Using the fact that f is of class C^2 with respect to z and splitting the terms exactly as in [3], we deduce (note that $|U_h| \leq M$)

$$\lim_{h\to\infty} I_h^{(1),-} \to \int_{B_1} \left\langle D^2 f(x,U,A) D^m v, D^m \varphi \right\rangle \, dy.$$

Thus the function v satisfies the following linear system:

$$\int_{B_1} \left\langle D^2 f\left(x,U,A\right) D^m v, D^m \varphi \right\rangle \, dy = 0, \tag{4.31}$$

for all $\varphi \in C_c^m\left(B_1;\mathbb{R}^N\right)$. Furthermore the uniform strict quasiconvexity of f directly translates into the following property of $D^2 f$, which is equivalent to the Legendre–Hadamard condition:

$$\int_O \left\langle D^2 f\left(x,U,A\right) D^m \varphi, D^m \varphi \right\rangle \, dy \geq c_M \int_O \left|D^m \varphi\right|^2 \, dy, \tag{4.32}$$

for all $\varphi \in C_0^\infty\left(O;\mathbb{R}^N\right)$ and with $0 \leq c_M < \infty$.

Now the theory for linear elliptic systems of higher order with constant coefficients (see [15]) applies and yields $v \in C^\infty(B_1)$ together with the estimate

$$⨍_{B_\tau} \left|D^m v - \left(D^m v\right)_\tau\right|^2 \, dy \leq c_M \tau^2, \tag{4.33}$$

for all $\tau \leq 1/4$.

STEP 3: UPPER BOUND: We define the sequence of rescaled integrands

$$\begin{aligned} f_h(z) \quad &\equiv \quad f_{U_h,A_h,\lambda_h}(z) \\ &:= \quad \lambda_h^{-2}\left[f\left(x_h,U_h,A_h+\lambda_h z\right) - f\left(x_h,U_h,A_h\right) - \lambda_h Df\left(x_h,U_h,A_h\right) z\right], \end{aligned}$$

for $h \in \mathbb{N},\ z \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}}$. For $r \in (0,1]$ and $w \in W^{m,1}\left(B_1;\mathbb{R}^N\right)$ we define furthermore

$$I_h^r(w) := \int_{B_r} f_h\left(D^m w\right) \, dx.$$

We will show now, that for almost any $r \in (0,1/6)$ there holds

$$\limsup_{h\to\infty} \left[I_h^r\left(v_h\right) - I_h^r(v)\right] \leq 0. \tag{4.34}$$

Exactly as in the first order case we first observe that the minimality of u_h translates into:

$$I_h^r\left(v_h\right) \leq I_h^r\left(v_h+\varphi\right) + \lambda_h^{-2} R_h^{\beta_2} \int_{B_r} \left|D^m \varphi\right| \, dy, \tag{4.35}$$

for all $\varphi \in W^{m,1}\left(B_1\right)$ with $\operatorname{supp}\varphi \Subset B_r$. Applying Lemma 3.4 we observe that the hypothesis for Lemma 3.3 are satisfied with $g \equiv f_h$, $\bar{u} \equiv v_h$ and $\mu = \lambda_h^{-2} R_h^{\beta_2}$. With the choice of the quantities made at the beginning of this section we observe that

$$⨍_{B_{\frac{1}{6}}} \left|\frac{V_{p(x_h)}\left(\lambda_h D^m v_h\right)}{\lambda_h}\right|^{2(1+\delta_3)} \, dx \leq c_M. \tag{4.36}$$

In order to show (4.34), we proceed as in [3]: Consider the sequence of Radon measures α_h defined by

$$\alpha_h(A) := \int_A \lambda_h^{-2}\left[\left|V_{p_2}(\lambda_h D^m v_h)\right|^2 + \left|V_{p_2}(\lambda_h D^m v)\right|^2\right] dy.$$

for Borel sets $A \subset B_1$. Since (α_h) is uniformly bounded there exists a subsequence – again denoted by (α_h) – and a Radon measure α with $\alpha_h \overset{*}{\rightharpoonup} \alpha$ $(h \to \infty)$. Since $\alpha(B_1) < \infty$, there holds $\alpha(\partial B_t) = 0$ for all except at most countably many $t \in (0,1)$. Thus without loss of generality we can assume $\alpha(\partial B_r) = 0$. Now let $0 < s < r < 1$ and $\eta \in C_c^\infty(B_r)$ with

$$0 \le \eta \le 1, \quad \eta \equiv 1 \ \text{ on } \ B_s, \quad \left|D^k \eta\right| \le \frac{c(m)}{(r-s)^k}, \quad \text{for } \ k = 1, \dots, m.$$

We test the minimality of v_h in the sense of (4.35) by the function $\varphi_h := \eta(v - v_h)$. Inserting the test function and using Lemma 3.4, a straight forward estimate under consideration of the properties of the function V_p leads to

$$\begin{aligned} I_h^r(v_h) - I_h^r(v) \quad &\le \quad c\alpha_h(B_r \setminus B_s) \\ &\qquad + c\lambda_h^{-2} \sum_{k=1}^m \frac{1}{(r-s)^{2kQ}} \int_{B_r \setminus B_s} \left|V_{p(x_h)}\left(\lambda_h D^{m-k}(v - v_h)\right)\right|^2 dx + o_h \\ &= \quad (I)_h + (II)_h + o_h, \end{aligned}$$

where o_h denotes a quantity for which there holds $o_h \to 0$. For proving that $(II)_h \to 0$, we use the strong convergence $\left|D^k(v - v_h)\right| \to 0$ in $L^{\underline{q}}(B_1)$ for all $k = 0, \dots, m-1$. In the case $p_2 \ge 2$, we do this by splitting

$$E_k^+ := \left\{x \in B_r \setminus B_s : \left|\lambda_h D^{m-k}(v - v_h)\right| \ge 1\right\}, \quad E_k^- := (B_r \setminus B_s) \setminus E_k^+,$$

and using the properties of the function V_p on the sets E_k^+ resp. E_k^- to estimate $(II)_h$ from above by terms containing $\|\lambda_h^{p_2-2}|D^{m-k}(v-v_h)|^{p_2}\|_{L^1(B_1)}$ and $\||D^{m-k}(v-v_h)|^2\|_{L^1(B_1)}$. Due to the strong convergence we see that $(II)_h \to 0$ as $h \to \infty$. In the case $1 < p_2 < 2$, we interpolate, defining $\theta := \frac{p(x_h)}{n+p(x_h)} < \frac{1}{2}$, $p^\# = p^\#(x_h) := \frac{2n}{n-p(x_h)}$ and estimating by Hölder's inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_{B_r \setminus B_s} \left|V_p\left(\lambda_h D^{m-k}(v - v_h)\right)\right|^2 dy \\ &\qquad \le \left(\int_{B_r \setminus B_s} \left|V_p\left(\lambda_h D^{m-k}(v - v_h)\right)\right| dy\right)^{2\theta} \\ &\qquad\qquad \cdot \left(\int_{B_r \setminus B_s} \left|V_p\left(\lambda_h D^{m-k}(v - v_h)\right)\right|^{p^\#} dy\right)^{\frac{2(1-\theta)}{p^\#}}. \end{aligned}$$

While the first factor is simply estimated by $c(n,p)\lambda_h^{2\theta}(\int_{B_r} |D^{m-k}(v - v_h)|\, dx)^{2\theta}$, we use Sobolev–Poincaré's inequality in the version of [9], Theorem 2 and Poincaré's inequality iteratively, to estimate the second factor from above, obtaining (note that $(\lambda_h D^{m-k}(v - v_h))_{0,1} = 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(\int_{B_r \setminus B_s} \left|V_p\left(\lambda_h D^{m-k}(v - v_h)\right)\right|^{p^\#} dy\right)^{\frac{2(1-\theta)}{p^\#}} \\ &\qquad \le c\left(\int_{B_1} \left|V_p\left(\lambda_h D^{m-k+1}(v - v_h)\right)\right|^2 dy\right)^{1-\theta} \\ &\qquad \le c\left(\int_{B_1} \left|V_p\left(\lambda_h D^m(v - v_h)\right)\right|^2 dy\right)^{1-\theta} \le c_M \lambda_h^{2(1-\theta)}. \end{aligned}$$

Taking these estimates together we conclude for any $p_2 > 1$:

$$I_h^r(v_h) - I_h^r(v) \le c_M \left[\alpha_h (B_r \setminus B_s) + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{1}{(r-s)^{2kQ}} \left(\int_{B_r} \left| D^{m-k} (v - v_h) \right| dy \right)^{2\theta} + o_h \right],$$

with $c_M \equiv c_M(n, N, M, m, \gamma_1, \gamma_2, L, \nu)$. For $h \to \infty$ the right hand side converges to $\alpha(B_r \setminus B_s)$, since $\left| D^{m-k}(v - v_h) \right| \to 0$ strongly in L^1 for $k = 1, \dots, m$, and the assertion (4.34) follows with $s \to r$ since $\alpha(\partial B_r) = 0$.

STEP 4: LOWER BOUND: We will now show that

$$\limsup_{h\to\infty} \lambda_h^{-2} \int_{B_{r/2}} \left| V_{p_2}(\lambda_h (D^m v - D^m v_h)) \right|^2 dy = 0, \quad \text{for } \; r \in (0, 1/12). \tag{4.37}$$

Therefore we proceed in a similar way to [3]: We consider $\frac{r}{2} < s < r < \frac{1}{12}$ and let $\varphi_h = \eta(v_h - v)$ with $\eta \in C_0^\infty(B_r), 0 \le \eta \le 1, \eta \equiv 1$ on B_s, $|D^k\eta| \le \frac{c}{(r-s)^k}$ for $k = 1, \dots, m$. Then we rewrite $I_h^r(v_h) - I_h^r(v)$ as follows:

$$I_h^r(v_h) - I_h^r(v) = [I_h^r(v_h) - I_h^r(v + \varphi_h)] + [I_h^r(v + \varphi_h) - I_h^r(v)] =: (I)_h + (II)_h.$$

In the sequel we estimate $(I)_h$ and $(II)_h$:

Estimate for $\boldsymbol{(I)_h}$: We proceed similarly to step 3 to conclude

$$|(I)_h| \le c_M \left[\alpha_h (B_r \setminus B_s) + \sum_{k=1}^{m} \frac{c}{(r-s)^{2kQ}} \left(\int_{B_r} \left| D^{m-k}(v_h - v) \right| dy \right)^{2\theta} + o_h \right].$$

Estimate for $\boldsymbol{(II)_h}$: Here we follow the argumentation of [3]. Therefore we only sketch the estimates here, pointing out the additional difficulties due to the higher order case: First, we do the splitting

$$\begin{aligned} (II)_h &= \int_{B_r} f_h(D^m \varphi_h)\, dy + \int_{B_r} [f_h(D^m v + D^m \varphi_h) - f_h(D^m v) - f_h(D^m \varphi_h)]\, dy \\ &=: (II)_h^{(1)} + (II)_h^{(2)}, \end{aligned}$$

with the obvious labelling.

Estimate for $\boldsymbol{(II)_h^{(1)}}$: Lemma 3.4 directly leads us to (note that $\eta \equiv 1$ on $B_{r/2}$)

$$(II)_h^{(1)} \ge c_M^{-1} \lambda_h^{-2} \int_{B_{r/2}} \left| V_{p(x_h)}(\lambda_h (D^m v_h - D^m v)) \right|^2 dy.$$

Estimate for $\boldsymbol{(II)_h^{(2)}}$: Exactly as in the first order case we see that for any given $0 < \sigma \le 1$ there exists a $\mathcal{L}^n-$ measurable subset $S \subset B_1$ with

$$\mathcal{L}^n(B_1 \setminus S) < \sigma \quad \text{ and } \quad \lambda_h(|D^m v_h| + |D^m \varphi_h|) \to 0 \; \text{ uniformly on } S.$$

Therefore we split as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \left| (II)_h^{(2)} \right| &\le \int_{B_r \setminus S} |f_h(D^m(v + \varphi_h)) - f_h(D^m v) - f_h(D^m \varphi_h)|\, dy \\ &\qquad + \left| \int_{B_r \cap S} (f_h(D^m(v + \varphi_h)) - f_h(D^m v) - f_h(D^m \varphi_h))\, dy \right| \\ &=: (II)_h^{(2,1)} + (II)_h^{(2,2)}, \end{aligned}$$

with the obvious meaning of $(II)_h^{(2,1)}$ and $(II)_h^{(2,2)}$.

Estimate for $\boldsymbol{(II)_h^{(2,2)}}$: As in [3, Proof of Prop. III.1, Step 5], [6, Proof of Prop. 3.4, Step 5] we see that

$$(II)_h^{(2,2)} \to 0 \quad \text{as} \;\; h \to \infty.$$

Estimate for $\boldsymbol{(II)_h^{(2,1)}}$: We set in the test function φ_h and proceed as in step 3 (using Lemma 3.4) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned} (II)_h^{(2,1)} \;\le\;& c\int_{B_r\setminus S}\left|\frac{V_{p(x_h)}\left(\lambda_h D^m v_h\right)}{\lambda_h}\right|^2 dy + c\int_{B_r\setminus S}\left|\frac{V_{p(x_h)}\left(\lambda_h D^m v\right)}{\lambda_h}\right|^2 dy \\ & + c\int_{B_r\setminus S}\lambda_h^{-2}\left|V_{p(x_h)}\left(\lambda_h\sum_{k=1}^{m}\binom{m}{k}D^k\eta\odot D^{m-k}\left(v_h - v\right)\right)\right|^2 dy. \end{aligned}$$

We use higher integrability (4.36) together with Hölder's inequality to estimate the first term above. The second term is controlled via the smoothness ov v on B_1, and the last term can be estimated exactly as in step 3 to conclude

$$(II)_h^{(2,1)} \le c_M|B_r\setminus S|^{\frac{\delta_3}{1+\delta_3}} + \sum_{k=1}^{m}\frac{C}{(r-s)^{2kQ}}\left(\int_{B_r}\left|D^{m-k}\left(v - v_h\right)\right| dy\right)^{2\theta} + o_h.$$

Combining the above estimates, passing to the limit $h \to \infty$, taking into account that $v_h \to v$ strongly in $W^{m-1,1}(B_1;\mathbb{R}^N)$ and using the bound ¿from above found in step 3, we conclude

$$\limsup_{h\to\infty}\lambda_h^{-2}\int_{B_{r/2}}\left|V_{p(x_h)}\left(\lambda_h\left(D^m v - D^m v_h\right)\right)\right|^2 dy \le c_M\left[\alpha\left(B_r\setminus B_s\right) + \sigma^{\frac{\delta_3}{1+\delta_3}}\right].$$

Now we first let $\sigma \to 0$ and then $s \nearrow r$, obtaining

$$\lambda_h^{-2}\int_{B_{r/2}}\left|V_{p(x_h)}\left(\lambda_h\left(D^m v - D^m v_h\right)\right)\right|^2 dy = o_h, \tag{4.38}$$

for almost every $0 < r < 1/12$. By the monotone dependence of the integral on the domain of integration the statement holds for all $0 < r < 1/12$.

To finish the proof of step 4, we should carry over the above estimate for $V_{p(x_h)}$ to V_{p_2}. This is done in [3, Proof of Prop. 4.2, step 5, p. 333] and applies for $D^m v$ instead of Dv in exactly the same way.

STEP 5: FINISHING THE PROOF: Firstly, a straight forward calculation, using Lemma 3.6, shows that by (4.22) there holds

$$\mu_h^{-2}\fint_{B(x_h,\tau R_h)}\left|V_{p_2}\left(D^m u_h - D^m u\right)\right|^2 dx = o_h, \tag{4.39}$$

and moreover

$$\mu_h^{-2}\left|V_{p_2}\left(\left(D^m u_h\right)_{x_h,\tau R_h} - \left(D^m u\right)_{x_h,\tau R_h}\right)\right|^2 = o_h. \tag{4.40}$$

We finish the proof by combining all the estimates we have shown before:

$$\begin{aligned} &\limsup_{h\to\infty}\mu_h^{-2}\Phi\left(x_h,\tau R_h\right) \\ &\qquad\le\; c_M\limsup_{h\to\infty}\mu_h^{-2}\fint_{B(x_h,\tau R_h)}\left|V_{p_2}\left(D^m u - \left(D^m u\right)_{x_h,\tau R_h}\right)\right|^2 dx \\ &\qquad\qquad + c_M\tau^\beta\limsup_{h\to\infty}\mu_h^{-2}R_h^\beta \\ &\qquad\overset{(4.28)}{\le}\; c_M\tau^\beta + c_M\limsup_{h\to\infty}\mu_h^{-2}\fint_{B(x_h,\tau R_h)}\left|V_{p_2}\left(D^m u - D^m u_h\right)\right|^2 dx \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&\quad +c_M \limsup_{h\to\infty} \mu_h^{-2} \fint_{B(x_h,\tau R_h)} \left|V_{p_2}\left(D^m u_h - (D^m u_h)_{x_h,\tau R_h}\right)\right|^2 dx \\
&\quad +c_M \limsup_{h\to\infty} \mu_h^{-2} \left|V_{p_2}\left((D^m u_h)_{x_h,\tau R_h} - (D^m u)_{x_h,\tau R_h}\right)\right|^2 \\
= &\quad c_M \tau^\beta \\
&\quad +c_M \limsup_{h\to\infty} \mu_h^{-2} \fint_{B(x_h,\tau R_h)} \left|V_{p_2}\left(D^m u_h - (D^m u_h)_{x_h,\tau R_h}\right)\right|^2 dx \\
\overset{(4.26),(4.28)}{\le} &\quad c_M \tau^\beta + c_M \limsup_{h\to\infty} \lambda_h^{-2} \fint_{B_\tau} \left|V_{p_2}\left(\lambda_h\left(D^m v_h - (D^m v_h)_\tau\right)\right)\right|^2 dy \\
\le &\quad c_M \tau^\beta + c_M \limsup_{h\to\infty} \lambda_h^{-2} \fint_{B_\tau} \left|V_{p_2}\left(\lambda_h\left(D^m v_h - D^m v\right)\right)\right|^2 dy \\
&\quad +c_M \limsup_{h\to\infty} \lambda_h^{-2} \fint_{B_\tau} \left|V_{p_2}\left(\lambda_h\left(D^m v - (D^m v)_\tau\right)\right)\right|^2 dy \\
&\quad +c_M \limsup_{h\to\infty} \lambda_h^{-2} \left|V_{p_2}\left(\lambda_h\left((D^m v)_\tau - (D^m v_h)_\tau\right)\right)\right|^2 \\
\overset{(4.33),(4.37)}{\le} &\quad c_M\left(\tau^2 + \tau^\beta\right) \\
\le &\quad \hat{C}_M \tau^\beta .
\end{aligned}
$$

Choosing for example $C(M) := 2\hat{C}_M$, we obtain the desired contradiction. This completes the proof of the excess decay estimate. □

4.4. **Iteration of the excess decay estimate.** We will prove that under suitable smallness– and boundedness conditions we can iterate the excess decay estimate to obtain an estimate of the form

$$\Phi(x_0, \tau^k R) \le c\tau^{\alpha k}.$$

This is the tenor of the following

Lemma 4.3 (Iteration)**.** *Let* $M \ge 2$, $B(x_0, 16R) \Subset O \Subset \Omega$, *where* $O \equiv O_M$ *is the open set from Lemma 4.2. Let* c_M *be the constant of Lemma 4.2 and let* $0 < \tau < 1/24$ *be chosen in such a way that* $c_M \tau^{\beta/2} < 1/4$. *Then there exists* $\eta \equiv \eta(M,\tau) \equiv \eta(M) \le \varepsilon_0 \le 1$, *where* ε_0 *is the constant from Lemma 4.2, such that if*

$$
\begin{gathered}
\left|(D^m u)_{x_0,\tau R}\right| + \left|(D^m u)_{x_0,R}\right| + \left|(D^m u)_{x_0,4R}\right| \le M/4 \quad \textit{and} \\
\left|\left(D^j u\right)_{x_0,R}\right| \le M/4 \quad \textit{for}\ \ j = 0, \ldots, m-1, \ ,
\end{gathered}
\tag{4.41}
$$

and

$$\Phi(x_0, R) \le \eta, \quad \Phi(x_0, 4R) \le 1 \tag{4.42}$$

are satisfied, then there holds

$$\left|(D^m u)_{x_0,\tau^k R}\right| \le M, \quad \Phi\left(x_0, \tau^k R\right) \le \tau^{k\beta/2} \quad \textit{for all}\ \ k \ge 1. \tag{4.43}$$

■

Proof. The proof of this lemma is in many points identical with the proof in the first order case (see for example [14] for the iteration scheme). The only additional difficulty consists of veryfying $(4.41)_2$ in every step. Therefore we only point out how to do this. So we assume that for $k = 0, \ldots, s$ there holds

$$\Phi(x_0, \tau^k R) \le (C_M \tau^{\beta/2})^k \Phi(x_0, R), \qquad \Phi(x_0, 4\tau^k R) \le c(M)\tau^{-2n} \Phi(x_0, \tau^{k-1} R).$$

To show $(4.41)_2$ in the case $p_2 \geq 2$ we start by writing

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|(D^j u)_{\tau^s R}\right| &\leq \left|(D^j u)_R\right| + \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} \left|(D^j u)_{\tau^k R} - (D^j u)_{\tau^{k+1} R}\right| \\
&\leq \frac{M}{4} + \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} \left(\fint_{B_{\tau^{k+1} R}} \left|D^j u - (D^j u)_{\tau^k R}\right|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\
&= \frac{M}{4} + \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} (II)_k,
\end{aligned}$$

with the obvious meaning of $(II)_k$. To estimate $(II)_k$, we note that $(DD^j u)_{\tau^k R}(x - x_0)$ has mean-value zero on balls centered in x_0. Therefore we obtain, applying Poincaré's inequality iteratively:

$$\begin{aligned}
(II)_k &\leq \tau^{-n/2} \left[\fint_{B_{\tau^k R}} \left|D^j u - (D^j u)_{\tau^k R}\right|^2 dx \right]^{1/2} \\
&= \tau^{-n/2} \left[\fint_{B_{\tau^k R}} \left|D^j u - (D^j u)_{\tau^k R} - (DD^j u)_{\tau^k R}(x - x_0)\right|^2 dx \right]^{1/2} \\
&\leq \tau^{-n/2} \left[c_P \tau^k R \left(\fint_{B_{\tau^k R}} \left|DD^j u - (DD^j u)_{\tau^k R}\right|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \right] \\
&\leq \tau^{-n/2} \Bigg[c_P^2 (\tau^k R)^2 \left(\fint_{B_{\tau^k R}} \left|D^{j+2} u - (D^{j+2} u)_{\tau^k R}\right|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\
&\qquad\qquad + c_P \tau^k R \left|(D^{j+2} u)_{\tau^k R}\right| \Bigg] \leq \dots \\
&\leq \tau^{-n/2} \Bigg[\left(c_P \tau^k R\right)^{m-j} \left(\fint_{B_{\tau^k R}} \left|D^m u - (D^m u)_{\tau^k R}\right|^2 dx \right)^{1/2} \\
&\qquad\qquad + \sum_{l=2}^{m-j} c_P^{l-1} \left(\tau^k R\right)^{l-1} \left|(D^{j+l} u)_{\tau^k R}\right| \Bigg].
\end{aligned}$$

Since by the induction hypothesis $(D^l u)_{\tau^k R} \leq M$ for $k = 0, \dots, s-1$ and $l = 0, \dots, m$, by the definition of the excess and with $\tau^k R \leq 1$ and Lemma 3.6 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
(II)_k &\leq \tau^{-n/2} \left[(c_P \tau^k R)^{m-j} \Phi^{1/2}(x_0, \tau^k R) + \Phi(x_0, \tau^k R) M \sum_{l=2}^{m-j} c_P^{l-1} (\tau^k R)^{l-2} \right] \\
&\leq \tau^{-n/2} c_P^{m-j} \Phi^{1/2}(x_0, \tau^k R) + c_M \tau^{-n/2} \Phi(x_0, \tau^k R).
\end{aligned}$$

Thus we end up with

$$\left|(D^j u)_{\tau^s R}\right| \leq \frac{M}{4} + \tau^{-n/2} \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} \left[c_P^{m-j} \Phi^{1/2}(x_0, \tau^k R) + c \Phi(x_0, \tau^k R) \right].$$

The induction hypothesis together with $c_M \tau^{\beta/2} \leq 1$ leads to

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|(D^j u)_{\tau^s R}\right| &\leq \frac{M}{4} + \tau^{-n/2} \sum_{k=0}^{s-1} \left[c_P^{m-j} \left(c_M \tau^{\beta/2}\right)^{k/2} \Phi^{1/2}(x_0, R) + c \left(c_M \tau^{\beta/2}\right)^k \Phi(x_0, R) \right] \\
&\leq \frac{M}{4} + c \tau^{-n/2} \frac{\Phi^{1/2}(x_0, R)}{1 - \sqrt{c_M \tau^{\beta/2}}} \leq M,
\end{aligned}$$

provided that $\eta \leq \frac{9M^2\tau^n}{16c^2}\left(1-\sqrt{c_M\tau^{\beta/2}}\right)^2$. Note that in the case $1 < p_2 < 2$ we can estimate similary to the case $p_2 \geq 2$, using the properties of the function V_p, and ending up with the same smallness condition on η (eventually with a modified constant c_M). $\square$

4.5. **Construction of the regular set.** We will show that the hypothesis of the excess decay estimate are satisfied on an open set Ω_0 of full n dimensional Lebesgue measure.

First we define

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_1 &:= \left\{ x_0 \in \Omega : \ \limsup_{\rho\searrow 0} \left(|D^m u|^{p(x)} \right)_{x_0,\rho} = +\infty \right\}, \\ \Sigma_2 &:= \left\{ x_0 \in \Omega : \ \limsup_{\rho\searrow 0} \left| \left(D^k u\right)_{x_0,\rho} \right| = +\infty \ \text{ for } \ k = 0,\ldots,m-1 \right\}, \\ \Sigma_3 &:= \left\{ x_0 \in \Omega : \ \limsup_{\rho\searrow 0} ⨍_{B(x_0,\rho)} \left| D^m u - \left(D^m u\right)_{x_0,\rho} \right| \, dx > 0 \right\}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.44}$$

We will show that the smallness conditions from Lemma 4.2 are fulfilled on the set

$$\Omega_0 \equiv \Omega \setminus \left(\Sigma_1 \cup \Sigma_2 \cup \Sigma_3 \right).$$

Remark. *The set* Ω_0 *is of full Lebesgue measure, which can be directly seen by Lebesgue's theorem, since by* $u \in W^{m,1}_{loc}(\Omega)$ *there holds* $D^k u \in L^1_{loc}(\Omega)$ *for* $k = 0,\ldots,m$.

Let $x_0 \in \Omega_0$, i.e.

$$\limsup_{\rho\searrow 0} \left(|D^m u|^{p(\cdot)} \right)_{x_0,\rho} < +\infty, \tag{4.45}$$

$$\limsup_{\rho\searrow 0} \left| (D^k u)_{x_0,\rho} \right| < +\infty, \quad \text{for} \quad k = 0,\ldots,m-1 \tag{4.46}$$

$$\liminf_{\rho\searrow 0} ⨍_{B(x_0,\rho)} \left| D^m u - (D^m u)_{x_0,\rho} \right| \, dx = 0. \tag{4.47}$$

Let $c_0 > 1$ be the constant of the higher integrability Lemma 3.1. With (4.45) and (4.46) we can assume that there exists $M \geq \max\{2, 8c_0\}$ such that

$$\left(|D^m u|^{p(x)} \right)_{x_0,2\rho} < \left(\frac{M}{8c_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{1+\delta_1}}, \quad \left| \left(D^k u\right)_{x_0,\rho} \right| \leq \frac{M}{4} \quad \text{for} \quad k = 0,\ldots,m\ , \tag{4.48}$$

for all radii $0 < \rho < \rho_0$ with $\rho_0 > 0$. With (4.47) there exists a sequence of radii $\rho_h \downarrow 0$ such that

$$⨍_{B(x_0,\rho_h)} \left| D^m u - (D^m u)_{x_0,\rho_h} \right| \, dx \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad h \to \infty.$$

We consider such a sequence ρ_h. Then a straight forward estimate shows

$$⨍_{B(x_0,\rho_h/4)} \left| D^m u - (D^m u)_{x_0,\rho_h/4} \right| \, dx \leq 2 \cdot 4^n ⨍_{B(x_0,\rho_h)} \left| D^m u - (D^m u)_{x_0,\rho_h} \right| \, dx,$$

and

$$⨍_{B(x_0,\tau\rho_h/4)} \left| D^m u - (D^m u)_{x_0,\tau\rho_h/4} \right| \, dx \leq 2\,(4/\tau)^n ⨍_{B(x_0,\rho_h)} \left| D^m u - (D^m u)_{x_0,\rho_h} \right| \, dx.$$

The constant M from above fixes c_M of the excess decay Lemma 4.2. Therefore $\tau \equiv \tau(M)$ in the excess decay estimate is fixed, and this again fixes the smallness parameter $\eta \equiv \eta(M,\tau)$.

Let $B < 1$ and θ be chosen in such a way that there holds

$$2^{(\gamma_2)^2} M \tilde{c}_M \left(B^{p_2\theta} + B^{2\theta} \right) \leq \frac{\eta}{4} \qquad \text{and} \qquad 1 = p_2\theta + \frac{1-\theta}{1+\delta_1/4},$$

where $\tilde{c}_M$ denotes the square of the constant appearing in Lemma 3.6. So we have

$$\frac{1}{p_2} > \theta = \frac{\delta_1/4}{p_2\left(1+\delta_1/4\right)-1} \equiv \theta\left(\delta_1, p_2\right) > 0, \qquad B \equiv B\left(M, \tilde{c}_M, p_2, \theta, \eta\right).$$

Then with the considerations above with $\rho_h =: 4R$ (for some $h \gg 1$) we have

$$\fint_{B(x_0,\sigma)} \left|D^m u - (D^m u)_{x_0,\rho}\right| dx < B, \tag{4.49}$$

for $\sigma = 4R, \sigma = R$ and $\sigma = \tau R$. Moreover we assume that R is so small that

$$(4R)^\beta < \frac{\eta}{4}.$$

Then by (4.3) and the higher integrability Lemma 3.1 one can easily see

$$\left(|D^m u|^{p_2(1+\delta_1/4)}\right)_{x_0,\sigma} \leq \frac{M}{2}.$$

Furthermore by interpolation between 1 and $p_2\left(1+\delta_1/4\right)$ one can see

$$\fint_{B(x_0,\sigma)} \left|D^m u - (D^m u)_{x_0,\sigma}\right|^{p_2} dx \leq 2^{(\gamma_2)^2} M B^{\theta p_2}.$$

Consequently we can estimate the excess $\Phi(x_0,\sigma)$ as follows: In the case $1 < p_2 < 2$ by $|(D^m u)_{x_0,\sigma}| \leq M$ we obtain with the properties of the function V_p:

$$\Phi\left(x_0,\sigma\right) \leq c_M \fint_{B(x_0,\sigma)} \left|D^m u - (D^m u)_{x_0,\sigma}\right|^{p_2} dx + \sigma^\beta \leq 2^{(\gamma_2)^2} M B^{\theta p_2} + \sigma^\beta \leq \eta.$$

In the case $p_2 \geq 2$ we obtain by Hölder's inequality and the properties of V_p:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Phi\left(x_0,\sigma\right) &\leq \tilde{c}_M \left[\fint_{B(x_0,\sigma)} \left|D^m u - (D^m u)_{x_0,\sigma}\right|^{p_2} dx + \left(\fint_{B(x_0,\sigma)} \left|D^m u - (D^m u)_{x_0,\sigma}\right|^{p_2} dx\right)^{\frac{2}{p_2}}\right] + \sigma^\beta \\
&\leq \hat{c}_M \left[2^{(\gamma_2)^2} M B^{\theta p_2} + 2^{(2/p_2\gamma_2)^2} M^{2/p_2} B^{2\theta}\right] + \sigma^\beta \\
&\leq \hat{c}_M M 2^{(\gamma_2)^2} \left[B^{\theta p_2} + B^{2\theta}\right] + (4R)^\beta \leq \frac{\eta}{2} \leq \eta.
\end{aligned}$$

Thus the conditions for the excess decay estimate are satisfied.

4.6. **Localization and Conclusion.** Now we will show that Ω_0 is actually open and that for $x_0 \in \Omega_0$, if (4.41) and (4.42) hold for a suitable M, there holds

$$\fint_{B(x_0,\rho)} \left|V_{p_2}\left(D^m u\right) - \left(V_{p_2}\left(D^m u\right)\right)_{x_0,\rho}\right| dx \leq C_M \rho^{\beta/4}, \tag{4.50}$$

for all $0 < \rho \leq \tilde{R}_M$.

Therefore, let $x_0 \in \Omega_0$ and M be fixed as in (4.48). Moreover let $R_M > 0$ be chosen as in the beginning, i.e.

$$\omega\left(R_M\right) \leq \frac{\delta_3}{4} \quad \text{with} \quad \delta_3 \equiv \delta_3(M),$$

where δ_3 denotes the higher integrability exponent from (4.1). Let furthermore be $R < R_M/32$, such that (4.49) holds for $\sigma = \tau R$, $\sigma = R$ and $\sigma = 4R$.

We set

$$O_M := B\left(x_0, R_M\right). \tag{4.51}$$

By step 2 the conditions (4.41) and (4.42) for the iteration are fulfilled. The iteration (step 1) provides

$$\left|(D^m u)_{x_0,\tau^k R}\right| \leq M, \quad \Phi\left(x_0, \tau^k R\right) \leq \tau^{k\beta/2}, \tag{4.52}$$

for all $k \geq 1$. Thus statement (4.50) follows immediately in the case $\rho = \tau^k R$ since

$$\fint_{B(x_0,\rho)} \left|V_{p_2}(D^m u) - \left(V_{p_2}(D^m u)\right)_{x_0,\rho}\right|^2 dx \leq \Phi\left(x_0, \rho\right) \leq C_M \rho^{\beta/4}.$$

The statement for arbitrary radii we obtain by interpolation.

Now by construction of O_M for any point $x_1 \in \Omega_0 \cap B\left(x_0, R\right)$ with $R \leq R_M/32$ there holds

$$B\left(x_1, R\right) \subset B\left(x_0, R_M\right) = O_M \qquad \text{for all} \quad R \leq R_M/32. \tag{4.53}$$

Thus also on $B\left(x_1, R\right)$ for $R \leq R_M/32$ the conditions for the iteration of the excess function are satisfied. In conclusion the regular set Ω_0 is open.

Now we have shown that

$$\fint_{B(x,\rho)} \left|V_{p_2}(D^m u) - \left(V_{p_2}(D^m u)\right)_{x,\rho}\right| dy \leq C_M \rho^{\beta/4}, \tag{4.54}$$

for all $x \in B\left(x_0, R_M/32\right)$ and for any radius $0 < \rho < R_M/32$. Campanato's integral characterization implies that $V_{p_2}(D^m u)$ is Hölder continuous with exponent $\beta/4$ on $B\left(x_0, R_M/32\right)$.

Now, as one can easily see, Hölder continuity carries over from $V_{p_2}(D^m u)$ to $D^m u$ itself, with exponent $\tilde{\beta} \equiv \min\{1, 2/p_2\}\beta/8$.

By (4.14) and (4.2) the Hölder exponent $\tilde{\beta}$ depends on the local situation (in particular on O_M). However the exponents β_1 and β_2 only depend on the global bounds γ_1, γ_2 of the function p (see Lemma 4.1). More precisely by

$$\tilde{\beta} = \min\{1, 2/p_2\}\beta/8, \qquad \beta = 1/2p_2 \min\{\beta_1, \beta_2\}$$

there holds

$$\tilde{\beta} \in \left[\tilde{\beta_1},\ \tilde{\beta_2}\right], \tag{4.55}$$

in which

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\beta_1} &\equiv \min\{1, 2/\gamma_2\} 1/(16\gamma_2) \min\{\beta_1, \beta_2\}, \\ \tilde{\beta_2} &\equiv \min\{1, 2/\gamma_1\} 1/(16\gamma_1) \min\{\beta_1, \beta_2\}. \end{aligned}$$

By a covering argument we can show Hölder continuity of $D^m u$ on the whole set Ω_0.

Thus the proof is finished. $\boxed{QED}$

References

[1] E. Acerbi and N. Fusco. A regularity theorem for minimizers of quasiconvex integrals. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, **99**:261–28, 1987.

[2] E. Acerbi and G. Mingione. Regularity results for a class of functionals with non-standard growth. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, **156**:121–140, 2001.

[3] E. Acerbi and G. Mingione. Regularity results for a class of quasiconvex functionals with nonstandard growth. *Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4)*, **30**:311–339, 2001.

[4] E. Acerbi and G. Mingione. Regularity results for stationary electro-rheological fluids. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, **164**:213–259, 2002.

[5] S. Campanato. Equazioni ellittiche del II ordine e spazi $\mathcal{L}^{(2,\lambda)}$. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.*, **69**:321–382, 1965.

[6] M. Carozza, N. Fusco, and G. Mingione. Partial regularity of minimizers of quasiconvex integrals with subquadratic growth. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.*, **175**:141–164, 1998.

[7] A. Coscia and G. Mingione. Hölder continuity of the gradient pf $p(x)$-harmonic mappings. *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Ser. I Math.*, **328**:363–368, 1999.

[8] F. Duzaar, J. F. Grotowski, and M. Kronz. Partial and full boundary regularity for minimizers of functionals with nonquadratic growth. *Journal of Convex Analysis*, **11**:1–40, 2004.

[9] F. Duzaar, J. F. Grotowski, and M. Kronz. Regularity of almost minimizers of quasi-convex variational integrals with subquadratic growth. *Ann. Mat. Pura Appl.*, , 2004.

[10] I. Ekeland. Nonconvex minimization problems. *Bill. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **1**:443–474, 1979.

[11] M. Eleuteri. Hölder continuity results for a class of functionals with nonstandard growth. *Boll. Unione Mat. Ital.*, **8**(7 - B), 2004.

[12] L. C. Evans. Quasiconvexity and partial regularity in the calculus of variations. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, **95**:227–252, 1986.

[13] L. C. Evans and R. F. Gariepy. Blowup, compactness and partial regularity in the calculus of variations. *Indiana Univ. Math. J.*, **36**(2), 1987.

[14] N. Fusco and J. Hutchinson. $C^{1,\alpha}$ partial regularity of functions minimizing quasiconvex integrals. *Manuscripta Math.*, **54**:121–143, 1985.

[15] M. Giaquinta. *Multiple Integrals in the Calculus of Variations and Nonlinear Elliptic Systems.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1983.

[16] M. Giaquinta and G. Modica. Regularity results for some classes of higher order non linear elliptic systems. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, **311-312**:145–169, 1979.

[17] J. Habermann. *Regularity results for functionals and Calderón–Zygmund estimates for systems of higher order with $p(x)$–growth.* Dissertation, University of Erlangen, 2006.

[18] J. Kristensen and G. Mingione. The singular set of minima of integral functionals. *Arch. Rational Mech. Anal.*, **180**:331–398, 2006.

[19] M. Kronz. Partial regularity results for minimizers of quasiconvex functionals of higher order. *Ann. I. H. Poincaré*, **19**(1), 2002.

[20] M. Kronz. Quasimonotone Systems of Higher Order. *Boll. UMI*, **8**(6 - B), 2003.

[21] M. Kronz. Habilitationsschrift, Universität Erlangen, to appear.

[22] J. J. Manfredi. Regularity for minima of functionals with p-growth. *J. Differential Equations*, **76**:203–212, 1988.

[23] P. Marcellini. Regularity of minimizers of integrals of the calculus of variations with non standard growth conditions. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.*, **105**:267–284, 1989.

[24] K. R. Rajagopal and M. Růžička. Mathematical modelling of electro–rheological fluids. *Cont. Mech. Therm.*, **13**:59–78, 2001.

[25] M. Růžička. *Electrorheological Fluids: Modeling and mathematical theory.* Springer, Heidelberg, 2000.

[26] W. Ziemer. *Weakly differentiable functions.* Springer, Heidelberg, 1989.